

17152.

409
Biography

E13493

LORD HERVEY'S MEMOIRS
VOLUME THREE



Queen Caroline
The Queen of England

QUEEN CAROLINE
by Rysbrack

SOME MATERIALS TOWARDS
MEMOIRS
OF THE REIGN OF KING GEORGE II

By JOHN, LORD HERVEY

Printed from a copy of the original manuscript in the
Royal Archives at Windsor Castle; and from the
original manuscript at Ickworth

EDITED BY
ROMNEY SEDGWICK
Sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOL. III



LONDON: 1931

MANUFACTURED IN GREAT BRITAIN

SOME MATERIALS
TOWARDS
MEMOIRS OF THE REIGN
OF
KING GEORGE THE SECOND
(Continued)

THIS day about two o'clock the King arrived at St. James's. The Queen attended by all her children and servants went down into the colonnade to receive him just as he alighted from his coach, and the whole ceremony of the meeting passed, kiss for kiss (the Prince's cheek not excepted), just as it had done the year before. But His Majesty's temper was very different, for as last year nobody had the good fortune to catch one smile from His Majesty, so now there was nobody who had the mortification to meet with one frown.

Everybody was astonished at all this unexpected sunshine, but the warmest of all his rays were directed towards the Queen. He said no man ever had so affectionate and meritorious a wife, or so faithful and able a friend. He took Sir Robert by the hand next morning in the circle at his levee, and whispered him in the ear that the Queen had given him a full account of his behaviour at every juncture, that he knew that he had behaved like a great and a good man, and that he should always remember it and love him for it.

1737 When Sir Robert told me this he said, to be sure one had always rather the Prince one served was kind to one than brutal; but for dependence on his favour he never had any, for he knew he loved nobody. "Therefore," said he, "the only real pleasure I had in this fine speech was the certain proof it gave me of Her Majesty's present way of thinking of me; for how great or how little soever my real merit may be, I know he could see none she had a mind to hide, nor I could want none she had a mind to show."

The day after the King arrived Sir Robert Walpole coming just from the Queen and meeting Lord Hervey at the foot of the backstairs, the sentinel being close to them, Sir Robert said to him in Latin: "Optime, Optime, omnia rident." To which Lord Hervey answered:

Prisca redit Venus
Diductosque jugo cogit aëneo
Flava excutitur Chloe
Rejectaeque patet janua Lydiae,¹

and then Sir Robert replied: "Dixit ad uxorem, 'quamquam videre pulchrior illa est, tecum vivere amem, tecum obeam libens.'"² Upon which they both laughed, parted, and agreed to meet the next morning to talk this matter over in plain English. But after Sir Robert was in his chair he called out to tell Lord Hervey he did not believe the Mr. Bis had been above, notwithstanding all this rant; to which Lord Hervey replied that if Mr. Semel had been there, it was better company than he believed had been at Kensington last year on the same occasion.

There was nobody triumphed more in this honeyed behaviour of His Majesty towards the Queen than the Princess Caroline, as she bragged to Lord Hervey that she had always told him it would be so. To which Lord Hervey replied there was an English proverb that said, "All's well that ends well," which he believed was more applicable to present circumstances than the Italian one of

¹Horace, Odes, III, 9.

²*Ibid.*

"Chi ben comincia, a la meta del opera." He said the 1737
King was a mere *enfant gaté*, and that his having been
whipped for five weeks together at Helvoetsluys, had made
him just supportable now, but that he'd be hanged if his
good Majesty would not be as intractable and insufferable
in a week as ever he had been in his life.

The Parliament which was to have met the Friday after
His Majesty arrived, was further prorogued to the
Tuesday se'night following.

There was a little epigram made by Mr. Pulteney on
its having been appointed to meet on a Friday, which I
think worth reciting and Lord Chesterfield worth owning,
for when it was given to him, he received the insinuation
with the same sort of avowing denial that he generally
put on when verses were ascribed to him which he had not
written, or mistresses that he had not lain with. The
verses were these:

The King this summer having spent
Amoribus in teneris,
Appoints his loving Parliament
To meet him Die Veneris.

There was another epigram made whilst the King was
at Helvoetsluys by the same author, and claimed by the
same plagiarist, on the Sheriffs that were to be appointed,
which was as follows:

What shall we do! (quoth Walpole to the Queen)
Unless the wind turn quick?
The sheriffs in all times have been
Still chosen by a prick.

Answer. Queen

The instrument that does the job
The King he has about him;
But can't you help me good Sir Bob,
To do the thing without him?

The two epigrams I have already transcribed Pulteney
himself told Lady Hervey were written by him, though

1737 given to and not denied by the little chattering cur, which was the name by which he generally distinguished Lord Chesterfield.

The two coarse and virulent satires that follow were really written by Lord Chesterfield:

Great George escap'd from narrow seas and storms
Now rides at large in Carolina's arms.
Bold Jonah thus, as holy writ will tell ye,
A whale received at once into her belly.

ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

What! just escaped from Cleopatra's charms
To souse at once into your Fulvia's arms?
With equal violence of haste to run
From blooming twenty to fat fifty-one.
Was it for this the youth abroad was sent,
And so much gold unprofitably spent?
So travelled Hottentot, refined in vain,
Returns with rapture to his Cyutts¹ again.

It would be endless to relate and transcribe all the things of this kind that were handed about upon this occasion, but one short comment in verse on the King's situation with regard to foreign affairs I will add, though I cannot say by whom it was written:

For nine long years George bullies, sneaks, and treats,
Pays useless armies and pacific fleets.
When war's proclaimed he shifts from court to court,
Loth to engage, yet promising support;
At length the peace is signed, Sir Robert says it,
And George, we're told, has read it in the Gazette.

Soon after the King came over the Archbishop of Canterbury died, and the Queen not being able to persuade Sir Robert Walpole to consent to the promotion of Bishop Sherlock on this occasion, nor Sir Robert to get Her Majesty to agree to the making Hare Archbishop,

¹? an English form of the German "Kajüte—a cabin."

and the Bishop of London being now out of the question, 1737 this supreme dignity in the Church was conferred on Potter, Bishop of Oxford.

Sir Robert Walpole, too, before the Parliament met, carried a message from the King to the Duke of Dorset to notify His Majesty's intention to dismiss him from the Lieutenancy of Ireland, and to let him know that as the Duke of Devonshire, who was now Lord Steward, was designed his successor, the King intended to give him the Steward's Staff.

On this occasion Sir Robert Walpole said to the Duke of Dorset: "Your Grace cannot but be sensible that not only I must have observed, but that it is known to and spoken of by all the world, that there has not been for some time that cordiality subsisting between your Grace and me which might be expected between a man who enjoys so great a share of the bounty of the crown and one who, unworthy as he may be of that honour, is thought to have so great an influence in dispensing that bounty.

"Your Grace must be sensible too that it would have been just as easy for me entirely to have dropped you at this time as to remove you from the office you now enjoy; but to show you I am still inclined to live well with you, I have not only consented, but proposed to the King, that you should be put into one of the most honourable posts the Crown has to dispose of. I cannot help telling your Grace at the same time how your conduct and mine is spoken of both by my friends and by those whom you may think or at least call yours. Those who wish me well are perpetually reproaching me with the levity I show towards those who are known not to do so, and add that it is an encouragement to all who only interestedly adhere to me to act the same double underhand part that my Lord Wilmington, Dodington, and yourself, have done for some years past. Nor do those whom you may fancy wish you better scruple to join with those whom you doubt not wish you ill in saying that though in open opposition there

1737 is something bold, honourable, and manly, yet in the game you are thought to play there is nothing but meanness, timidity, and dishonour. If, therefore, I take your characters from my friends, I must look upon you as men who betray me whilst you act with me, and if from your own, as men who wish me ill, but dare set no step to do me harm. I could have described these two opinions in a much shorter way, but the two words made use of on this occasion are too coarse to repeat; and for my Lord Wilmington, I assure you 'Old Woman' is the most honourable title I have heard is given him by those who are most my enemies."

The Duke of Dorset, as Sir Robert Walpole told me, took all this very patiently, but denied the justice of the charge, thanked Sir Robert for not laying him aside, and made all sorts of professions of gratitude, attachment, and the etcetera compliments that are continually chimed in the ears of those who have power by those who are bending the knee to its altars.

Sir Robert Walpole, with all his dexterity on some occasions, and his knowledge of those he had to deal with, sometimes made as gross mistakes as if his natural sagacity had given him no share of the first of these qualities, nor his long experience any proficiency in the last. An affectation of too much familiarity with people of the highest rank and a very coarse manner of being familiar drew him into these scrapes; and his way of talking to and of the Princesses Emily and Caroline on occurrences to which he should not only have shut his mouth, but his eyes, went so far at this time that a message was sent to him from them in form by the Duke of Grafton to desire he would discourse no more in that strain. The Duke of Newcastle's coquetry to the Princess Emily, and Her Royal Highness's coquetry back again to him, as the only male creature who made up to her, had been often the topic of very ill-understood raillery, in very gross terms, uttered by Sir Robert Walpole, and not very privately.

He has often and before many people, in the expressions 1737
of a porter, told the Duke of Newcastle he would certainly
draw himself into some scrape, for as the Princess Emily
thought of nothing but the main point and his Grace of
nothing but the outwork Her Royal Highness would
certainly catch him alone one day and ask him the
question; upon which his Grace would be frighted out of
his wits and run away, whilst she would hate him for so
doing, and tell her papa and mama to be revenged of him,
that he had offered to ravish her.

Sir Robert Walpole had not said this once or twice, or
in private only, but it had been almost his daily topic of
conversation to and of the Duke of Newcastle for these
last seven or eight months; and often rather more than
hinted by him in mixed companies at dinner, even before
servants.

The last conversation of this nature, that occasioned
the messages which I have mentioned, was part of it in
the Queen's morning drawing-room, and the rest in the
apartment of the Princesses, where Sir Robert went to
fetch the Duke of Newcastle away to dinner. If I were
to relate all the particulars they would be incredible,
considering by whom these things were said and to whom;
but how strong they were may be guessed when Sir Robert,
who loved hunting and often took his metaphors from
that science, carried on an allegory on this occasion
between the apartment of the Princesses and a dog kennel,
in which he made the Duke of Newcastle one of the
principal puppies of his parable and the two Princesses
what, I believe, is as unnecessary as unfit to repeat, when
I say he called them in plain terms, during this every way
ill-understood raillery, what a hackney coachman would
think the last affront he could offer in words to an apple-
woman.

All this was told by the Princesses to the Queen, who
was very angry with Sir Robert Walpole for what had
passed, but never spoke to him about it, expecting, I

1737 suppose, what did indeed happen, that the message by the Duke of Grafton would suffice to reform him.

Nor was this the only subject on which Sir Robert Walpole at this time ruffled the temper of the Queen towards him; for whilst Her Majesty, with a little female and conjugal pride united, was every day telling Sir Robert Walpole in private how uninterruptedly kind the King's behaviour had been towards her ever since his arrival, Sir Robert used to shake his head, shrug his shoulders and laugh, and to tell her: "Madam, do not flatter yourself. For pleasure of the body there must be youth on one side; and believe me, marriage is never so properly called one flesh as after twenty years' marriage, for no husband then knows his wife's from his own."

It was in vain for Her Majesty to give him instances of the King's expressions of kindness and affection towards her. Sir Robert still persisted, and told her: "'Tis compensation, Madam, for the sins of the summer; and he thinks to expiate the crime of real fondness to his mistress by putting it on to his wife."

The King, having got a violent cold in his journey and taken no care of it at his first arrival, was extremely out of order, too, at this time, having at once the piles, a violent pain in one side of his head, and a little fever. This disorder, for which the King was at last forced to shut himself up and keep his bed, Sir Robert Walpole would insist to the Queen was principally occasioned by the disorder of his mind; that it was pining and fretting; and that he would never be well till she would send for Madam Walmoden to nurse him.

Whilst he grew every day worse and worse, it was every day by the Queen and Princesses given out that he was better and better. Very few people saw him, and all those who did had more than hints given them before they went in to be sure to take care not to ask him how he did. Poor Lord Dunmore, one of his Lords of the Chamber, the first day of his week's waiting, having not received these

instructions or neglecting them, as soon as he went into the King told His Majesty how extremely sorry he had been for his indisposition, and said he hoped His Majesty was much better; to which the King made not one word of answer, and the moment Lord Dunmore went out of the room he sent for Lord Pembroke, and bid him as Groom of the Stole to say he would take this week's waiting, His Majesty adding that his reason for giving these orders to Lord Pembroke was that he might not see any more of those troublesome, inquisitive puppies who were always plaguing him with asking impertinent, silly questions about his health like so many old nurses. 1737

Sir Robert Walpole continued every day plaguing the Queen, and whenever she told him the King was better than he had been, or better than people thought him, he used to answer her only with shaking his head and saying: "Do you flatter me, Madam, in telling me what you do not believe, or do you flatter yourself and believe what you say?" This often made the Queen peevish with him and complain of him to Lord Hervey, telling Lord Hervey at the same time: "You often pity me for the snubs and rebukes I meet with from the King, but I assure you the affronts I meet with there are nothing compared to what I receive from your friend Sir Robert. I cannot imagine what ails him, or who it is he listens to. In the first place, he wants to persuade me the King is dying; in the next, that he knows him better than I do; and what is more extraordinary still, is telling me every time he sees me that my being from morning to night in the King's room is owing to my forcing myself upon him, and that he had much rather be without my company."

Lord Hervey did not tell Sir Robert Walpole again what the Queen had said to him in the last article, but in general let him know that he often found the Queen dissatisfied with the incredulity she said she always found in Sir Robert Walpole when she made any reports from the King's bedchamber; to which intimations from Lord

1737 Hervey Sir Robert Walpole always answered with complaining of her unreasonableness, her blindness or hypocrisy in all these points, and said he would continue to tell her the truth, let her take it as she would; but notwithstanding this way of talking to Lord Hervey, and defending what he had done, he changed his manner of acting towards the Queen, which plainly showed he thought he had been in the wrong; which at the same time demonstrated that, as difficult as it is for people to correct their faults, it is more difficult still to own they want correction, since he could bring himself to the one though he could not to the other.

During the King's confinement the Princess wrote to the Queen to desire she might be permitted to make Mrs. Townshend (against whom the King had objected in the first regulation of her family) her Bedchamber woman. The Queen thought the application at this time a little unseasonable, and returned for answer to the Princess that the King was at present so much out of order that she could not think of troubling him with any solicitations in his present situation, but would take the first proper opportunity to let him know what the Princess had desired; though the King had formerly declared himself so explicitly on this head, that she did not believe he would easily be brought to consent to what was proposed. The Princess's letter was not only of the Prince's ordering and inditing, but, as the Queen told me, of his own handwriting, and very little disguised. The Queen's answer to it the Prince complained of as very hard usage, and said as he found he could never expect in any thing to have common justice shown him by the King and Queen he must apply for it elsewhere. This speech, with a great many others of the like nature, were conveyed to the King and Queen, who always hated their son without any interruption, but despised and feared him by turns.

The meeting of the Parliament having been already put off to the 1st of February, and the supplies of the year

necessary to be granted making it impossible to postpone 1737
it longer, the Parliament was opened by Commission.
The King, in the Speech delivered by his order by the
Lords Commissioners, took notice of the disorders and
commotions there had been this summer in various parts
of the kingdom, and recommended to the Parliament the
care of putting a stop to these everyday increasing insults
offered to the Government.

Soon after the Parliament met, Lord Carteret, in the
House of Lords, moved for a day to take the King's Speech
into consideration. The night before the day appointed for
that purpose, there was a meeting at Lord Harrington's,
where there were present seven or eight of the Cabinet
Council, Lord Cholmondeley, Lord Delaware, and Lord
Hervey, who were convened to settle what was to be done
the next day; but nobody knowing what point Lord
Carteret intended to go upon, these Lords parted in just
the same situation they had met.

This was the last time Lord Chancellor Talbot went
abroad; he was then ill, and died of a pleuritic fever in *Feb. 14*
a very few days after, universally lamented. Lord
Hardwicke alone, and he only internally, rejoiced at this
incident. There had ever been a rivalry between these two
great men, and of course that hatred ever consequential
to rivalry, which is always as strong, though not always so
conspicuous, among great as little men. Lord Hardwicke,
too, had sense enough to know that, as there were but
these two considerable law lords in the House of Lords,
the authority there of him that was left must be greatly
increased, when there was nobody to be put in of equal
consequence either to him that remained or him that was
taken away.

Lord Hardwicke was very soon after made Lord
Chancellor, and not only felt, but often too plainly showed
he felt, how considerable he was become.

When Lord Carteret came to declare what part of the
King's Speech he intended to consider, it proved to be

1737 that paragraph relating to the riots; and after mentioning every one which I have before given an account of in these papers, he said, as that in Scotland was of the most flagitious kind, he thought it was what chiefly deserved the animadversion of Parliament, and ought to be first inquired into. He seemed in his Speech to threaten Scotland extremely, and speaking of the enormous behaviour of the City of Edinburgh in this transaction, said that many cities (and gave examples) had been totally disfranchised for much less crying offences.

He then descanted on the trial of Captain Porteous, and said he thought he had not only been illegally put to death, but illegally condemned, and hoped the House would take the trial into consideration as well as the murder; adding that if Captain Porteous had been condemned according to law, he was sure the criminal law of Scotland was so defective as to require great alterations; and if he had been unjustly condemned, that it would become the legislature to call his judges to an account. At the conclusion of this speech he made two motions, one to order the Lord Provost and the four bailies to attend the House on that day month, the other for an authentic copy of the proceedings at the trial of Captain Porteous.

Lord Carteret's reason for stirring this inquiry was because he hoped by these means either to force the Administration to anger Scotland by punishing, or to be too strong for them if they endeavoured to screen. He hoped too to show the Scotch that, by taking the Campbells to govern them, they had chosen governors that could not protect them; and he fought with more alacrity on this occasion, from having learned that he was got upon a point that was not disagreeable to the King and Queen, whatever it was to their Minister.

Sir Robert Walpole had two reasons for being sorry this inquiry was set on foot. In the first place, he dreaded this affair becoming national, which must have bad consequences; and in the next, he feared it might hurt Lord

Ilay, for he had no more a mind to be thought incapable of 1737
protecting Lord Ilay than Lord Ilay had a mind to be
thought incapable of protecting the Scotch, Lord Ilay
having been of great use to him ever since he had employed
him in the management of the Scotch elections, both for
Peers and Commoners.

During this month given for the coming up of the
provost and bailies of Edinburgh, an affair of yet greater
moment was brought on the tapis, the Prince and his
friends having determined to lay his dispute with his
father about the £100,000 a year before the Parliament.

Lord Hervey was the first who told the Queen that it
was certainly a measure agreed upon. The way he came
to know of it was this. The Prince, who solicited every
mortal to be for him on this occasion, sent the Duke of
Marlborough to Mr. Henry Fox (the younger of the two
brothers, Lord Hervey's most intimate friends, often
mentioned in these papers¹) to desire him to vote for him;
and at the same time sent Mr. Hamilton, a brother of
Lady Archibald Hamilton, to Mr. Stephen Fox, the elder
brother. The Duke of Marlborough meeting with Mr.
Henry Fox before Mr. Hamilton found the other brother,
Mr. Henry Fox came immediately to Lord Hervey, told
him what had passed, and said the answer he had given to
the Duke of Marlborough (and he never wanted a quick
and a proper one) was that he should certainly do as his
brother did, whatever that should be.

Lord Hervey said this affair had been so often talked
of, and so often dropped, that he could not believe it would
be brought into Parliament; but Mr. Henry Fox assured
him it certainly would, and that the Prince's people must
have conducted their affairs very secretly and cleverly, or
the Ministers have been fast asleep, or had very bad
intelligence, if they did not know it would be so, since he
believed there was not one man in opposition who had not

¹Possibly in the missing portion, relating to 1730-1732. Hitherto they
have been seldom mentioned.

1737 been already spoken to and solicited. He gave Lord Hervey leave to tell the thing to the Queen, but not to name the Duke of Marlborough. Accordingly, Lord Hervey went directly to Her Majesty, waited till she came on some errand out of the King's bedchamber (where she was shut up all day), and then told her of this measure being certainly taken. She would not at first believe it, gave the same reasons for her incredulity to Lord Hervey, that he had done for his to Mr. Fox, but at last, like him too, began to change her opinion. Lord Hervey begged her not to tell the King of it that night, as it could be of no service, and would certainly set him a fretting, probably keep him awake, and of course increase his fever, which would answer one of the ends he believed was proposed by the timing this measure; which was, knowing the King's warm prompt temper, to put him in such a passion as, in his present weak condition, and which they thought weaker than it was, might go a good way towards killing him.

The Queen assured Lord Hervey she would not name it to the King that night, and Lord Hervey said it was as silly as well as impertinent for him to pretend to direct her what was the best way to behave on any occasion to the King; but that he could not help adding on this, that when she did break it to him, he hoped it would be in the gentlest way she could, or it would certainly do him more hurt than his fever and piles put together, and prevent all the surgeons, doctors, and apothecaries in town doing him any good.

The Queen bid Lord Hervey be sure to go early the next morning to Sir Robert Walpole, to tell him all he knew about this affair, and wished him a better night than she said she hoped to have herself; she was very lavish in her abuse on her son, but not more so than her daughter Caroline, to whose apartment Lord Hervey went directly from the Queen, to communicate what had passed.

The next morning Lord Hervey went to Sir Robert, who told him he had from two channels the night before

had intelligence that confirmed all Lord Hervey reported, 1737 and said he had long told both the King and Queen that this measure would sooner or later infallibly be taken, and that the many douceurs shown to people in the son's conduct, and the few in the father's, would make this a troublesome point to the latter, notwithstanding his superior power.

Lord Hervey went back immediately to St. James's to acquaint the Queen with what Sir Robert had desired him to tell her, and found her at least as impatient as he expected to receive further intelligence of the true state of this affair. She said she had not yet broken it to the King, but would go and prepare him for Sir Robert's arrival, who, Lord Hervey told her, would come to Court that morning at the usual hour.

The King took the first notice of this business with more temper and calmness than anybody expected he would; and the Queen, from the beginning of this affair to the end of it, was in much greater agitation and anxiety than I ever saw her on any other occasion.

Nothing was ever more universally talked of, or more strongly solicited; the Prince himself was as busy as his emissaries, closeted as many members of either House as he could get to come to him, and employed all his servants and friends to speak to every mortal on whom they thought they could possibly prevail, and many even where there was not that possibility.

The general tenor of his applications was, how sorry he was to have it so little in his power at present to show his goodwill to his friends, and offering carte blanche for promissory notes of payment when he came to the Crown, with strong insinuations at the same time how near the King's health seemed to bring that happy day.

Many on the King's side fearing the Prince would carry this point in the House of Commons, if it came to be tried there, all means were used to prevail on the Prince to desist. Lord Hervey advised the Queen to send for the

1737 Prince, and speak to him herself, to set forth how dear the victory would cost him, supposing he could gain it, and how little he would get by it; to tell him it would weaken, if not destroy the interest of his family in general in this country, and that it would be impossible for him to get anything by it, as the King would certainly part with his crown rather than give him what he wanted or demanded; to tell him too that the King, if he should be brought to the disagreeable necessity of not complying with an address of Parliament, would still have the resource of dissolving that Parliament and calling another; and that by changing hands the King would always have it in his power to get the better of him, as there were none of those who now seemingly stood by him, though they only in reality made a fool of him, who would not give him up to come into power; and that the King, if driven to extremities, would buy them to give up his son, not his son to give up them, since the danger was in the party, not in him; and as it was, he made use of their strength, not they of his; the yielding, if there was any, would be to them, not him.

The Queen told Lord Hervey that her speaking to the Prince would only make him more obstinate; and besides that objection, that he was so great a liar it made it extremely unsafe for her to venture any conference with him, as there was nothing he was not capable of asserting had passed between them, not even that she had attempted to murder him. The excise year she said she had sent for him, and on that occasion she was so sensible of his being capable of denying everything he had said or had been said to him, and relating what had never been mentioned, that she had left the door from her bedchamber into her dressing-room (where she saw him) half open, and placed the Princess Caroline behind it, to hear and be a witness to everything that passed, as the Princess Caroline had before told me.

The Queen therefore determined she would not see him, though Sir Robert Walpole did all he could too to

persuade her, and told Lord Hervey, when Lord Hervey 1737 reported to him what I have here related, that he had spoken to the Queen to the same effect, and that he believed besides the reasons she had given to them for not speaking to her son, that she had two more which she had not given—the one her pride, the other the apprehending the King on this occasion might have some jealousy of any private conference between the Prince and her at this juncture.

However, that the Prince should be spoken to by somebody to the effect I have mentioned was judged by everybody to be proper, and Lord Scarborough by everybody thought a proper man for that purpose.

The Queen, after making Lord Scarborough a thousand compliments on his integrity, his understanding, his weight, and good intentions for the service of her family, desired him on this occasion to represent to the Prince the folly as well as iniquity of what a parcel of boys and flatterers had put him upon; to show him the impossibility of his being a guinea the richer for it, whether he carried this vote or not, and the certainty of weakening the interest of his family by trying it, which, next to the King, it was more his interest than anybody's in the kingdom not to shake.

Lord Scarborough did so, talked to His Royal Highness very freely and very warmly, and told him too that there never was a measure taken since the Hanover family was on the throne, which, were he a Jacobite, would have given him half so much pleasure, as it was the strongest blow that had ever been given to the Whig party, by whom alone the Hanover family could be safely or long supported. But all Lord Scarborough's rhetoric was employed in vain. The Prince had had his lesson given him, and when anybody talked to him in this strain, he stuck to this answer: that he did not in the least design to distress his father's measures in any one point; that he thought £100,000 a year was his due, and designed for him by the Parliament

1737 when the Civil List was given; that he believed there was not a man in the kingdom who was not of the same opinion; but since the King did not understand it so, or would not comply with the intention of the Parliament if he did understand it like every other body, he hoped there was no great crime in only desiring the Parliament to expound their own acts; and if there was any ill consequence attended such an application, it was not the fault of him, but of those who drove him to that only method he had left to obtain justice and what was his due, and consequently such persons were to answer for any ill effect it might have, not he.

When Lord Scarborough found he could not alter him he took his leave by telling His Royal Highness he wished he might not have reason to repent of his perseverance, and that for his own part he would do all he could whenever things came to an open rupture between him and his father to support his father against him; that he had seen in the late reign how much a family quarrel had cooled the affections of the people to the family in general; and that he should not wonder if the bulk of mankind, who were attached to no family but for their own interest, would be glad to have any family here rather than one who entailed from one generation to the other the hereditary curse of driving their friends always to that disagreeable option of making themselves desperate either with the prince who wore the Crown or the heir apparent to it.

Before Lord Scarborough was sent to the Prince on this errand Sir Robert Walpole had desired Lord Baltimore, one of the Prince's Lords of the Chamber, and Mr. Hedges, his treasurer, to try their skill and interest with His Royal Highness, and see what they could do towards diverting him from this measure; but they both reported much the same success of their embassy, said His Royal Highness had hardly patience to hear them speak, but stormed and strutted, and bounced, and said he should look upon those who advised him against this only way he

had of doing himself justice, to be as much his enemies as 1737 those who had driven him to the necessity of taking it; and Sir Robert Walpole himself told me that the King and Queen, in their sallies against their son, let so many things drop to the Princess Emily (who could keep nothing), or to some other body, by whom they got round, relating to these negotiations he had with the Prince's servants, that he was determined to break them all off, as it was impossible for him to carry them on without communicating them to the King and Queen, unless he would expose himself to their suspicions in case they got intelligence of them in any other way; and by communicating them he exposed his friends in the Prince's family to the same inconveniences there.

Lord Chesterfield and the young men were thought to be the chief stimulators of the Prince in this measure; that is, the Dukes of Marlborough and Bedford, and Messrs. Grenville, Lyttelton, and Pitt.

Lord Carteret it was thought was not much for it; and Mr. Pulteney against it, having told the Prince with regard to the Whig party when he was first consulted much the same things that Lord Scarborough had done.

Besides this, Pulteney was apparently much softened with regard to the Court in his way of talking this year; was certainly no Jacobite (at present at least), though things this year seemed to favour that cause more than he wished; and had listened to and encouraged a sort of treaty that was underhand carrying on to make him a peer, buy his silence, and give him rest; but when it came to [the point] he could not stand the reproach he thought he should incur by striking this bargain, and, with that irresolution that was always the predominant defect in his conduct, went on without having courage sufficient either to quite make it or quite break it.

The eldest Mr. Fox was offered by the Prince the absolute promise of a peerage, but refused it. Lord Hervey did not let him lose this merit with the King and

1737 Queen, and said it was certainly the greatest sacrifice Mr. Fox could make, as there was nothing to a man of his fortune but that which could be worth his receiving from a Court, or at least nothing else comparable to it.

But even this could not draw the costive nature of the King's ungiving spirit into a promise of rewarding Mr. Fox for refusing such an offer on one side of the house by making it on the other. When Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole of the offer made to Mr. Fox, he told him likewise: "Mr. Fox's friendship to me, Sir, made him leave the answer he shall give to the Prince entirely to my direction. And what can I say?" Sir Robert answered: "I know what some people should say." "And why," replied Lord Hervey, "do you not make those people say what you own they ought to say?" "Because," replied Sir Robert, "it is hard to make them say what they should, on any giving chapter; because, my Lord, they are as reluctant to bestow honours as money, and are more set against making peers than against any measure I could propose to them; and from this general maxim—that it is increasing the price of everybody they are to buy and not paying them." "I will remove that difficulty on this occasion," said Lord Hervey, "with regard to Mr. Fox, by pawning my honour Mr. Fox shall never ask anything of you besides (if this is done) as long as you are a Minister; and further will engage, if the King is afraid of losing a vote in the House of Commons, that Mr. Fox shall for nothing bring in anybody you will name in his room at Shaftsbury." This conversation ended with Sir Robert's promising Lord Hervey he would do all in his power to bring this matter to bear; and Lord Hervey often spoke to the Queen on this subject to the same effect; and since the rewarding the elder brother must be postponed, often pressed both her and Sir Robert to show some mark of favour in the interim at least to the younger brother, that it might appear to the world that two men of their figure, understanding, and character, who had served the Court so long, so faith-

fully, so assiduously, and so expensively to themselves as 1737
well as creditably for those they served, were not totally
neglected; and that Sir Robert Walpole and the King
might not show all young men of distinction and fortune
in England who were coming into the world and had their
plis to take, that it was their interest not to attach them-
selves to the reigning Prince or the present Minister.
Lord Hervey added, too, that his own character and credit
were in a great degree concerned in this question; for
if nothing was done for these young men, it must be
concluded by all the world that nothing could have kept
them down but the interest of the Duke of Newcastle
being so much superior to his that if anybody who
deserved ever so well of the Court attached themselves to
him, it should be sufficient to defeat the pretensions of
any merit and services.

I mention this solicitation so particularly, to show with
what difficulty even at this time any favour was extorted
from the Court; and it is easy to guess how unsuccessful
many solicitations, the accounts of which are too tedious
and too little interesting to be here inserted, must have
been, when even this, for men of the consideration of
these two brothers, and backed by the almost quotidian
application of Lord Hervey's interest, moved so slow
a pace.

It being thought that the report of the King's state of
health, which was imagined by everybody out of the
palace, and many in it, to be much worse than it really was,
aided the Prince's solicitations, everybody about the
Queen who had her ear advised her to persuade the King,
if it was possible, to keep himself no longer locked up in
his bedchamber, but to come out and show himself; as
the belief of his being in a declining condition made many
people less willing to resist the importunities of the heir
apparent to the Crown on this occasion, than better
informed of the state of the King's health they possibly
would be.

1737 The King therefore was prevailed upon to have levees, and see everybody in a morning as usual; and though he looked pale and was much fallen away, he looked much better than those who had not seen him during his confinement expected. He was much more gracious too, to everybody, than he used to be; and from the first day he came out began to recover his looks, flesh, and strength, much faster than could have been expected.

But notwithstanding all this, there were few on his side so sanguine as not to apprehend his son's carrying his point in the House of Commons. All the lists made by the Prince's people gave him a majority of near forty; and by Mr. Winnington's list, who was reckoned one of the best calculators on the King's side, the Prince had a majority of ten. These calculations alarmed Sir Robert Walpole, who thought, not unreasonably, that his fate, at least as a Minister, depended on this question.

The King behaved in public with great seeming unconcern, and even in private with unaccountable temper; the Queen well in public, but to those before whom she appeared with less constraint her invectives against her son were incessant and of the strongest kind, and her concern so great, that more tears flowed on this occasion than I ever saw her shed on all others put together. She said she had suffered a great deal from many disagreeable circumstances this last year—the King's staying abroad, the manner in which his stay had been received and talked of here, her daughter the Princess Royal's danger in lying-in, and the King's danger at sea—but that her grief and apprehensions at present surpassed everything she had ever felt before; that she looked on her family from this moment as distracted with divisions of which she could see or hope no end—divisions which would give the common enemies to her whole family such advantages, as might one time or other enable them to get the better of it; and though she had spirits and resolution to struggle with most misfortunes and difficulties, this last she owned

got the better of her; that it was too much for her to bear; 1737 that it not only got the better of her spirits and her resolution, but of her appetite and her rest, as she could neither eat nor sleep; and that she really feared it would kill her.

The Princess Caroline, who loved her mother and disliked her brother in equal and extreme degrees, was in much the same state of mind as the Queen, her consideration and regard for her mother making her always adopt the Queen's opinions, as well as share her pleasures and her afflictions. They neither of them made much ceremony of wishing a hundred times a day that the Prince might drop down dead of an apoplexy, the Queen cursing the hour of his birth, and the Princess Caroline declaring she grudged him every hour he continued to breathe, and reproaching Lord Hervey with his weakness for having ever loved him, and being fool enough to think that he had been ever beloved by him, as well as being so great a dupe as to believe the nauseous beast (those were her words) cared for anybody but his own nauseous self, that he loved anything but money, that he was not the greatest liar that ever spoke, and would not put one arm about anybody's neck to kiss them, and then stab them with the other, if he could get five guineas for it and run no risk of being found out. She protested that from the time he had been here six months—so early had she found him out—she had never loved him better or thought better of him than at that moment.

The day before that which was appointed for the *Feb. 21* great debate of this important question in the House of Commons, all hopes being now lost of preventing its coming there by any methods which had hitherto been tried, Sir Robert Walpole, who feared extremely, unless something was done to alter the present situation of things, the King's party would be beaten, resolved to persuade the King to send a message to the Prince to make a sort of treaty of composition.

1737 He sent for Lord Hervey early in the morning, communicated this design to him, and told him the particulars of this overture of accommodation were for the King to tell the Prince he would settle a jointure forthwith on the Princess (which really had been under consideration), and at the same time to let the Prince know he would settle the £50,000 a year he now gave him, out of his power.

Lord Hervey said in the first place he believed Sir Robert would find great difficulty in bringing the King into this measure; in the next, that he did not believe it would alter a vote—that everybody would call it a show of yielding in the King, and giving nothing; but that what he feared most of all was, lest the King and Queen, who hated their son so inveterately, might construe it to be a management for their son in Sir Robert Walpole, and never forgive it him.

To this Sir Robert answered that without a measure of this kind he should certainly to-morrow lose the question: that the great cry of the most moderate people was composed of the injustice of having yet given the Princess no jointure, and the Prince being only a pensioner at pleasure on the King, by having nothing secured to him; and though, in reality, what he proposed was, as Lord Hervey said, giving the Prince nothing, and the £100,000 was the chief point, yet these two objections and complaints which he had mentioned being removed by the King's sending this message, it would disarm the Prince's party of two arguments against which there was no answer to be found; that as to the umbrage the King and Queen might take at it, and the jealousies it might infuse in their minds of his having underhand any management for the Prince, he must risk it and do as well as he could to combat those consequences; "and as it is my way, you know, my dear Lord, and when you come to be in my place I advise you to make it your way too, to provide against the present difficulty that presses, I think I shall by this message either get the Prince to postpone

to-morrow's affair and enter into treaty, or have it to say 1737 for the King to-morrow that he had made the first step to peace, and that his son had refused to parley, and sounded this Parliamentary trumpet to battle."

Lord Hervey said Sir Robert Walpole was a much better judge what to do in this case than he pretended to be, but it was his opinion the message would neither put off the battle, nor get him one deserter; and that to his own troops it would have an air of diffidence and retreat; besides the danger which he mentioned before, and what he thought most to be avoided, which was giving a distrust of his favouring the Prince to the King and Queen, who were too apt to be suspicious on all occasions, and were particularly so he knew wherever their son was concerned.

Sir Robert said he had talked of this measure last night to the Pelhams, and that they were both extremely for it. "You will say, I know (says he), they are always of the temporising and palliating side, and I grant you they are so, and generally there are points too on which we differ, but I really think now it is all we have left for it; and as there is no time to be lost, I will dress, go to Court this moment, and go to work upon our stubborn master."

Accordingly they went together to St. James's, where Sir Robert Walpole, by the same arguments I have already mentioned, first brought the Queen into this measure, and then the King. The Dukes of Grafton and Devonshire (Lord Chamberlain and Lord Steward) were first sent to the Prince to let him know the Cabinet Council had a message to deliver to him from the King, and to desire to know when they might wait on him; and the Prince saying they might come whenever they pleased, the Lord Chancellor, Lord President, Lord Steward, Lord Chamberlain, Dukes of Richmond, Argyll, and Newcastle, Earls of Pembroke and Scarborough, and Lord Harrington, repaired immediately to the Prince's apartment, and Lord Chancellor from a

1737 written copy read the following message to His Royal Highness:

His Majesty has commanded us to acquaint Your Royal Highness in his name that, upon Your Royal Highness's marriage, he immediately took into his royal consideration the settling a proper jointure upon the Princess of Wales; but his sudden going abroad, and his late indisposition since his return, had hitherto retarded the execution of these his gracious intentions; from which short delay His Majesty did not apprehend any inconvenience could arise, especially since no application had in any manner been made to him upon this subject by Your Royal Highness; and that His Majesty hath now given orders for settling a jointure upon the Princess of Wales, as far as he is enabled by law, suitable to her high rank and dignity, which he will, in proper time, lay before his Parliament, in order to be rendered certain and effectual for the benefit of Her Royal Highness.

The King has further commanded us to acquaint Your Royal Highness that, although Your Royal Highness has not thought fit, by any application to His Majesty, to desire that your allowance of fifty thousand pounds per annum, which is now paid you by monthly payments, at the choice of Your Royal Highness, preferably to quarterly payments, might, by His Majesty's further grace and favour, be rendered less precarious, His Majesty, to prevent the bad consequences which he apprehends may follow from the undutiful measures which His Majesty is informed Your Royal Highness has been advised to pursue, will grant to Your Royal Highness, for His Majesty's life, the said fifty thousand pounds per annum, to be issuing out of His Majesty's Civil List revenues, over and above Your Royal Highness's revenues arising from the Duchy of Cornwall; which His Majesty thinks a very competent allowance, considering his numerous issue, and the great expenses which do and must necessarily attend an honourable provision for his whole family.

To this message His Royal Highness returned a verbal answer, which the Lords of the Council who attended him, immediately after they received it, withdrew to put into writing to the best of their recollection, and delivered it to the King in the following words:

That His Royal Highness desired the Lords to lay him, with all humility, at His Majesty's feet, and to assure His Majesty that he

had, and ever should retain, the utmost duty for his royal person; 1737
that His Royal Highness was very thankful for any instance of His Majesty's goodness to him or the Princess, and particularly for His Majesty's intention of settling a jointure upon Her Royal Highness; but that as to the message, the affair was now out of his hands, and therefore he could give no answer to it.

After which His Royal Highness used many dutiful expressions towards His Majesty; and then added: "Indeed, my Lords, it is in other hands; I am sorry for it:" or to that effect.

His Royal Highness concluded with earnestly desiring the Lords to represent his answer to His Majesty in the most respectful and dutiful manner.

It was very plain by this answer that the Prince was very willing and ready to receive any favour the King pleased to bestow upon him, and to return as good words as he received, but not to take words instead of money, or to recede from any step he had taken, or to slacken his pace in what he had resolved to pursue.

The King and Queen were both extremely enraged at this reception of the message. The King reproached Sir Robert Walpole a little roughly for having persuaded him to send it; to which Sir Robert Walpole answered that the good he expected from it was to be reaped to-morrow, not to-day; and that he had proposed to bring the House of Commons to reason by it, not the Prince.

The Queen was more particularly piqued at the Prince's behaviour on this occasion from a circumstance that did not appear in the drawing up the Prince's answer, which was his stepping forward, whilst the Lords of the Cabinet Council were with him, and saying in a sort of whisper to my Lord Chancellor that he wondered it should be said in the message that he had made no application to the King on this business, when the Queen knew he had often applied to His Majesty through her, and that he had been forbidden by the King, ever since the audience he asked of His Majesty two years ago at Kensington relating to his marriage, ever to apply to him again any way but by the Queen. To which speech of the Prince's Lord Chancellor

1737 very prudently made no other answer than asking the Prince aloud if what he had said to him was part of the answer he designed should be conveyed to the King, and if it was, he desired His Royal Highness would be so good to repeat it to all the Lords of the Council. But the Prince said: "No, my Lord; I only said it to inform you how that matter stood."

The Queen said on this occasion she had always known her son to be the most hardened of all liars, but did not imagine even he was capable of exposing himself as such on so solemn an occasion to all the Lords of the Cabinet Council; and did protest that directly nor indirectly he had never desired her at any time to speak to the King about the increase of his income; and that if he persisted in saying he had, she would be glad to have him asked where and when and who was by; or, if he said it had been always at tête-à-tête, the dispute must then remain on the evidence of her word against his; but that it was very odd if he had made this application so often, nobody should ever happen to have been present, especially when she did not remember she had ever seen him so often alone as to make frequent applications with nobody present possible. She said before he was married he had, before his sisters, often talked to her of his debts and his expenses and his poverty, but never even then desired her to speak to the King to increase his allowance; but since the increase of it at his marriage he had not even talked to her in that strain.

All this the Queen said to Sir Robert Walpole, and most of it to the Lord Chancellor, to the Bishop of Salisbury, to the Master of the Rolls, and to several other people separately whom she saw in private, and has many times to me sworn to the truth of every word of it; adding always, to everybody she spoke to on this subject, that she was sorry to be forced to expose her son in this manner, but that he had made it unavoidable by endeavouring to lay the whole blame of this dispute between him and his

father to her charge. But what his pique to her could be, 1737 she said, she could not imagine, since she was sure it had never been her inclination, any more than it was her interest, to widen any breach between him and his father; and she has often told me that she never had been snapped by the King on any ten subjects put together so often as she had been on that one of trying to palliate the conduct of her ungrateful son.

The next morning after the message, which was the day this great point was to be opened in the House of Commons, the Queen sent for Lord Hervey the moment she was up, to inquire what people said in the town of the message that had been sent the day before; expressing herself great disapprobation of the measure, and saying: "All you other great and wise people were for it, and so one was forced to give way; but I knew that *canaille* my good son so well that I was sure he would only be more obstinate on any step taken to soften him. You know as well as I that he is the lowest stinking coward in the world and that there is no way of gaining anything of him but by working upon his fear. I know, if I was asleep, or that he could come behind me, he is capable of shooting me through the head, or stabbing me in the back; but if he had ten swords and pistols and came to murder me, though I was quite alone, if I was awake and saw him and held up this pin and said: 'You villain! touch me if you dare!' he would tremble and cry and fall at my feet and ask forgiveness and then wait for another opportunity when I had no pin in my hand to murder me. But what do people say of the impertinent, silly answer he sent yesterday? And of the King's message? Do not people think it was great condescension in the King?" "Madam," replied Lord Hervey, "those that are with us magnify the merit of it extremely; and those that are against us say it has an air of condescension, but, in reality, is giving nothing; for as the King could not have taken away the £50,000 a year and leave his son to starve or beg, nor could the Parliament

2737 have suffered it, so the settling it is only making a show of a new concession, without really having made any; and as to the jointure, they say there is no sum named, consequently that part of the message is worth as little as the other; and if there is any advantage accrues to the Prince by this concession (as it is called), I suppose those who have put the Prince upon bullying have sense enough to impute all the merit of it to themselves; and to tell the Prince if anything is got by it, it is those who put him upon bullying who have got it for him. I suppose they tell him (at least I would in their place if I had a mind to keep him warm) that he sees the only way to get anything is to bully; that he would never have been married if he had not frightened the King into by the audience they made him ask two years ago at Kensington; that by marrying he got his allowance more than doubled; that if he had not frightened the King by this step of appealing to Parliament, he never would have got even this £50,000 a year secured to him, nor a jointure for the Princess; and that if he will listen to them and go on menacing, and bullying, and frightening, and appealing, he will at last get everything he wants." "Why, then (said the Queen), you do not approve the message?" "I cannot say," replied Lord Hervey, "I approve or disapprove it; it is above me; and to be able to determine whether it was a proper measure or not, I must have talked to as many members of the House of Commons as Sir Robert Walpole has done, must be able to know what effect it will have on their opinions and conduct, and what alteration it is likely to produce in the calculation made before this measure of the votes which are to be given this day; of all which things there is nobody in England but Sir Robert who can be a competent judge."

"But was there ever anything so weak" (said the Queen) "as saying, as he does in his answer, that the affair is no longer in his hands, and that he is sorry for it? Is not that saying that he is to be governed by these people, not they by him? In whose hands is he? and how came he

so much in their power?" Lord Hervey said: "The worse 1737
his answer is, Madam, the better for those to whom it was sent. Had I been to have given it, it should have been very different, and embarrassed the Court much more than it will now do. In the first place if the Prince had had any sense or any good advisers, he would have desired time to give his answer in writing to a written message, and upon mature consideration, and consulting all the best heads about him, I doubt not but he would have been advised to express himself with the utmost duty to the King, to bewail his hard fate in having his designs represented to the King as undutiful, which appears by the words in the King's message had been his misfortune, and that nothing but the King's absolute commands should or could have hindered him from applying to His Majesty in the first place either for any favour or justice he thought he might expect from his goodness, and that any round-about way (which was the only one His Majesty's injunctions had left him) he had found so fruitless and ineffectual, that a modest and humble request to the Parliament of England, who had given the Crown to his family, and who had given all that was to support the honour and dignity of it, he hoped could never be construed an indecent step, especially when it was to ask nothing of them but to explain their own acts; and that if there was any dispute between him and his father, that he knew no mediator so proper as the Parliament, nor any arbitrator to whose decisions he should so cheerfully and implicitly submit, especially since he could not hope to find any proper ambassador about the King to plead his cause, after the fatal experience of those who had his ear having advised him to forbid his son making any application to him in person, and representing his conduct in so unjust and false a light as to provoke the King to give it the hard and undeserved title of undutiful." The Queen interrupted and said there was enough, and that she was very glad he had not been so advised, or rather that he had

1737 thought his own wise head so able to guide him, as to have allowed himself no time to ask any advice. "But tell me, do you think the fool can have interest enough to carry this point? Do not people know him? What do they think of him and what do they say of him?" "Madam," replied Lord Hervey, "whatever they think of him or whatever they say of him, the people in Opposition will doubtless, for two reasons, be glad to have him join them; in the first place to swell their party, and in the next to wipe off the imputation of Jacobitism." "These are your nasty favourites the Whigs," said the Queen; "they are always squabbling with one another. The King has shown he would stand by them and would support them; but if they will not stand by him and support him, he has but one party to take—he must employ the Tories. The Tories are ready to come; there they are; he has but to beckon them, and there is not one but will come to St. James's the moment he calls. The Whigs have forgotten the four last years of Queen Anne's reign; they want to feel the oppression again of Tory masters to teach them what they owe to a King that has supported them; and if they are of such a nature as never to know the value of the favour of the Crown, whilst they enjoy it, they may thank themselves for being taught their duty by ill-usage."

Lord Hervey said: "There is nobody, to be sure, Madam, who wishes well to the present Establishment, who could advise Your Majesty to continue the Whigs in power, if it appeared they were so broken among themselves as to be unable longer to carry on the King's business; but hitherto, I own, I can see no foundation for that complaint, or that they have not been as ready to support all the rights of the Crown as any set of people who boast their zeal for prerogative the most. It is true, whenever I speak to any Whigs to influence them in this disputed point between the King and the Prince, I always try to alarm them by saying, if the Prince should carry this point, the King must afterward look upon this Parliament

as his son's Parliament, not his; that he would consequently 1737
be obliged to dissolve it; and that nobody can imagine he
would dissolve one Whig Parliament to choose another
Whig Parliament, but would certainly employ the Tories.
But I am far from thinking the King need be driven to
this desperate remedy merely on losing this question,
unless the same majority distressed him in others; and
I call taking the Tories a desperate remedy, because I
believe they will never be long found willing to support a
Revolution Government, nor will Your Majesty find any
disputes among the majority, that may arise in a Tory
Administration, to be about one branch of your family
against another, but against your whole family in favour
of another. If this was the case in the four last years of the
Queen's reign, you will find it again so whenever the same
party is in power; for as the majority of the Tories are
certainly Jacobites, so when they act as a party they must
act according to the principles and sentiments of the
majority of that party, not of the few."

While Lord Hervey was speaking (the Queen and he
both standing at the window of her dressing-room), the
Prince happened to walk undressed across the court. The
Queen spied him, and said, reddening with rage: "Look,
there he goes—that wretch!—that villain!—I wish the
ground would open this moment and sink the monster to
the lowest hole in hell." Lord Hervey was quite astonished
to see the looks and hear the tone in which these words
were uttered; which the Queen perceived and said: "You
stare at me; but I can assure you if my wishes and prayers
had any effect, and that the maledictions of a mother
signified anything, his days would not be very happy nor
very many."

I have tacked the broken parts of the morning's
conversation together as well as I could, but it was often
interrupted by messages the Queen was sending to a
thousand people about their attendance in the House
to-day, and the answers she received to them. The things

1737 I have related were not only the topics of this particular conversation but of many others; for she was for ever now talking of the Prince and seldom with more patience. But what I least liked was the King's talking of the scheme for a Tory Administration as much as Her Majesty; for had she only thrown out these menaces to those whom she thought friends to the Whig party I should have looked upon them rather as alarms given, to put the Whigs upon their mettle against the common enemy, and a piece of policy to unite them in the support of the King, than the tokens of Her Majesty really designing to execute such a plan; but when it was gone so far as to have the King talk in that style too, as he never long talked in any she did not approve, I began to apprehend the Whigs at this time were in real danger. And had the Bishop of Salisbury, who was always endeavouring to strengthen her bias towards the Tories, not shocked her predominant inclination at this time by endeavouring to bring her to a composition with her son, when she wanted to take anybody that would have oppressed him most, had he condemned making any concessions to him, railed at Sir Robert Walpole for advising the King to send the message, and told her Lord Carteret and the Tories would carry this matter with a higher hand, I know not what would have been the consequence. But with all his parts, Bishop Sherlock had the weakness perpetually to share the demerit of those whom he wanted to ruin, and to dip himself in those measures which he ought to have exploded and laid hold of to distress his enemies by combating; and instead of saying that the King and Queen had been advised by Sir Robert Walpole to do too much, he advised more to be done, and told the Queen the only safe way she could take to end this dispute was to persuade the King to allow his son something more, which, how right soever it might have been for their interest, was certainly not right for his point, which was the ruin of Sir Robert Walpole, whom at this time he could no way so efficaciously or at

least so hopefully have attacked as by endeavouring to persuade the Queen that Sir Robert showed a much greater regard and tenderness towards the Prince in this dispute than was necessary. 1737

There was one material thing Lord Hervey said to the Queen this morning, in the conversation I have just given an account of, which I forgot to insert; but not piquing myself much upon method in these papers, and relating things only just as they occur to my memory, and as I happen to have leisure to set them down, without giving myself the trouble, and indeed without having time to go back and interweave them in their proper places, I shall mention it here.

Part of Lord Hervey's answer to Her Majesty's invective against the Whigs for dividing on this question was that he would never say it out of that room, but to be sure the misfortune of their splitting at this time, was in reality owing to the King and the Prince; to the latter, for appealing to Parliament without having first tried all other methods, and to the first for not giving the £100,000 a year to the Prince at the time he gave the £50,000, when indisputably it was understood at the time the Civil List was settled that the Prince should have so much allowed for his maintenance as his father had had when he was Prince of Wales. "And though I grant, Madam, that this was not a condition or appropriation mentioned in the Act of Parliament that settles the Civil List, nor do I remember it was particularly mentioned, yet when this Civil List was asked and the reasons for asking it were opened by Sir Robert Walpole, it must be understood, that if the additional expense incurred by there being a Queen Consort was a reason for a larger Civil List, it must be upon a supposition that all other expenses were to be the same as they had been in the late reign, otherwise it could be no argument for increase; for if the Queen and Prince together were to have no more than the Prince alone had before, the same sum would be sufficient to defray the expenses of the

1737 King's family in this reign that did suffice in the last." To this the Queen answered: "You sometimes, my dear Lord, despise the Master of the Rolls extremely, and now you talk just like him." Lord Hervey found he had gone too far, but softened what he had said and retrieved himself a little by adding that there was, notwithstanding what he had advanced, a very material difference at this time between his way of thinking and that of the Master. "For though, Madam," continued Lord Hervey, "I cannot help thinking, if anybody had been asked to enumerate the articles that made up the expenses of the Civil List when it was asked, they would have named £100,000 a year to the Prince as one of them, and consequently, that it might be thought the King should have given it, yet I am far from being of the Master of the Rolls' opinion that the King ought to suffer it to be extorted from him in this manner; or that his conduct, whatever people may think of it, must not now be defended."

The Queen said the Civil List was given to the King with a discretionary power to do what he thought fit with it; and that the Parliament, since they had made it his property without conditions, had no more business now to meddle with it, than they had to meddle with the private property of any other man in the kingdom, and that they might with as much justice cut and carve out of the estate of every father in England what they thought a proper provision for his eldest son, as in this instance. "I grant it, Madam," replied Lord Hervey; "and whatever people may think of the equity of the King's voluntarily giving or not giving the £100,000 a year, I do admit that the Parliament has no right now to force him."

Feb. 22 Mr. Pulteney, notwithstanding his having advised the Prince not to stir this affair in Parliament, when it came into Parliament was the mover of it in the House of Commons. Lord Hervey at present, notwithstanding former quarrels, wished him better success, in case of Sir Robert Walpole's death, than he did to any other man

who put in for the reversion of Sir Robert's power; and 1737
to Lady Hervey (who wished him still better than her
Lord, and with whom, whenever they met in third places,
he used to talk with great friendship, familiarity, and
confidence) he said, on her reproaching him with the
indiscretion of dipping himself in this affair, that since,
contrary to his opinion and counsel, the Prince would
have the motion made, he could not oppose it, and thought
he should make a better figure in taking the lead, than
in fighting an underpart, and acting as a subaltern.

He began with great pomp, and said he had a matter
to offer to the consideration of the House, of greater im-
portance perhaps than anything that ever had been moved
there, as it concerned persons of the first rank in the king-
dom, as well as the favourite and most valuable privilege
of that House, which was the appropriation of money they
gave, and seeing those appropriations strictly observed
and complied with. He then proceeded to show from our
English histories, running through the dynasties of most
of our kings, that it had been the practice and policy of all
times to put the heir-apparent to the Crown in a state of
independency, and give him an established revenue of his
own. He then came down to precedents of later date since
the Restoration, and mentioned the Post Office and wine
licences given to the Duke of York, who was but heir-
presumptive to the Crown, in the reign of his brother,
King Charles II. Another instance he gave of an indepen-
dent settlement made by Parliament on one who was but
heir-presumptive to the Crown, was the £50,000 a year
given by Parliament in the reign of King William and
Queen Mary to the Princess Anne of Denmark, the late
Queen. He then descanted on the establishment made on
this King at the beginning of the reign, setting forth how
much greater it was than any other king ever had; and
how little reason there would have been for making it so,
if it could ever have been supposed the expenses of it were
to be so much less in so material an article as the provision

1737 for a Prince of Wales; the support of whose honour and dignity the Parliament was concerned for next to the King's, more than any person's in the kingdom; nor could he see or imagine what reason could be given why as ample a provision should not be made for this Prince of Wales as had ever been made for any other, or for his father before him. He then threw in some personal compliments to the Prince of Wales, but sparingly, and dwelt chiefly on the design of the Parliament when the Civil List was granted, to have £100,000 a year given to the Prince when he should come over, be married, and settled here, insisting upon it that though this he acknowledged was only a tacit condition in the grant of the Civil List, yet as it was at the same time, though a tacit condition, a condition that was universally understood, so it behoved the Parliament, in justice to themselves as well as to the Prince, to make such an Address to the King as he mentioned in the motion he concluded with; which was humbly to beseech His Majesty to settle £100,000 a year on the Prince, in the same manner that His Majesty had enjoyed it when he was Prince of Wales, and to settle the same jointure on the Princess of Wales as was settled on the Queen when she was Princess of Wales. I have only given the substance of the motion, which was extremely well drawn, and which anybody who has a curiosity to see it may turn to in the Journals of the House of Commons.

In Mr. Pulteney's speech, which lasted above an hour and a half, there was a great deal of matter and a great deal of knowledge, as well as art and wit; and yet I cannot but say I have often heard him speak infinitely better than he did that day. There was a languor in it that one almost always perceives in the speeches that have been so long preparing and compiling. Men of great talents and quick parts, who have knowledge and readiness, a natural eloquence, a lively imagination and a command of words, always in my opinion, which is founded on my observation, speak best upon the least preparation, supposing them

masters of their subject; for, besides their thinking with 2737
less vivacity and emotion on subjects they have often
thought of, their growing tired of them, and having their
fancy palled to them, in these cases of preparation their
memory works more than their invention; and they are
hunting the cold scent of the one, instead of pursuing the
warm chace of the other. And as most orators warm others
in the degree or in proportion to the degree in which they
themselves are warmed, so they can never affect their
audience so much with things they have thought of till they
are unaffected with them themselves as they will with
those which they utter at the time that they are most
affected with them themselves, which is generally in the
first conception of them.

And it is from this cause that all good speakers, in my
humble opinion, speak better on a reply than at any other
time, though Sir Robert Walpole on this occasion, even in
replying, lost these advantages I have mentioned; for, as
he knew beforehand all the arguments to which he was
to answer this day, so his answers were as much prepared
and thought of as those things to which he was to answer;
and, to my ears at least, there was the same languor, and
that same want of the *vivida vis*, which appeared in the
performance of Mr. Pulteney, and which I have often
heard both of them speak without wanting, and possess
superior, I think, to any two men I ever heard, and at
least equal, I believe, to any two men that ever had the gift
of speech.

Sir Robert Walpole, very early in his answer to Mr.
Pulteney, told the House the orders he had received from
the King to communicate to them the message His Ma-
jesty had sent the day before to the Prince, and the answer he
had received to it; Sir Robert Walpole read both the one
and the other to the House as part of his speech, and com-
mented on both as he read them very emphatically,
making use of all his oratory, art, and Parliamentary skill,
when he came to that part of the Prince's answer where

1737 His Royal Highness says and repeats, "Indeed, my Lords, it is in other hands; I am sorry for it." This message, Sir Robert said, was at once an answer to two parts of Mr. Pulteney's motion and arguments, which were those relating to the Princess's jointure, and the independent establishment of the Prince; what therefore remained for him to consider was only the quantum allowed to the Prince, and the propriety of the House interposing in that matter, considering the manner in which the Civil List had been granted to, and was enjoyed by, His Majesty.

As to all Mr. Pulteney had quoted from the English history relating to the settlements made by Parliament on the heir-apparent to the Crown, from the time of Edward III. (for so high the instances given by Mr. Pulteney had been traced), Sir Robert said they were none of them parallel to the present case, nor examples that would justify the step Mr. Pulteney now proposed the Parliament should take; since all those settlements out of the several kings' revenues had been made by Parliament by an original motion from the Crown, desiring the Parliament only to confirm grants made by the Crown; and not by the Parliament first making application to the Crown, and cantoning out the possessions and property of the Crown in the manner and degree that the Parliament thought fit; that after the Restoration the revenues from the wine-licences and Post-office were given to the Duke of York by Parliament immediately after the Restoration, and not by Parliament addressing King Charles to part with what they had before made his property without conditions; and that the instance of the £50,000 a year paid out of the Civil List of King William to the Princess Anne of Denmark, though it seemed at first sight to be the nearest a parallel to the present case, was in the most material circumstance no parallel at all, since the Parliament gave it (as appears from the words of the resolution), not out of what they had already given to the King, but whilst the revenue was settling, and made the appropriation of this

money at the same time they made the grant of it. If there- 1737
fore what is now proposed (continued Sir Robert), had
been proposed on the present King's first accession to the
throne, whilst the Civil List was settling, I would have
admitted that the instance of what was done in the reign
of King William would have been a case in point, but now
it is widely and essentially different; for as the words of the
Civil List Act show that the Civil List is given to the King
to support the honour and dignity of the Crown, and the
maintenance of his royal family in general, without any
particular appropriation to particular branches of the
royal family, so any future appropriations would, as far
as they extend, be so many resumptions of the grant of the
Civil List made to the King, and an infringement of what
was now the King's property; nor could there be any
reason given if the Parliament now took upon themselves
to look into the allowance made by the King out of his own
property to the Prince, why the Parliament might not as
well examine what he allowed to the Queen, the Duke, or
any of the Princesses; why they might not make themselves
judges of that too, and direct, in all those instances as well
as this, by the same parity of reasoning, what the King
should allow to any one branch of his family.

As to what had been said of the present Civil List being
so much greater than that of the late King, Sir Robert
said at a medium, even with the £115,000 included, what
the Civil List Revenues had brought in during the King's
whole reign did very little exceed £800,000 per annum;
and though the late King had but £600,000 a year, yet
when the Prince's £100,000 per annum was added to that,
together with the million of the Civil List lottery, and the
£300,000 given by the two offices of insurance to pay the
debts of the Civil List (which two sums, amounting to
£1,300,000, and the late King having reigned thirteen
years, made an addition to the Civil List of £100,000 per
annum more), it did appear that in reality the late King
had had a Civil List of £800,000 per annum as well as the

1737 present King. If, therefore, the income of the two Kings was equal, and the disbursements out of the Civil List of the late King to the maintenance of his royal family was only £100,000 to the Prince, the late King having no wife and but that one child, it was plain he had £700,000 per annum left for himself; and consequently £100,000 per annum being given out of the Civil List by this King (£50,000 to the Queen and £50,000 to the Prince), his present Majesty would not have more left for his own use than his father had had; and further, as his present Majesty, besides this establishment on the Queen and Prince, paid to the Duke an establishment of £8,000 per annum (which must soon too be an increased expense), as his Majesty paid likewise £5,000 per annum to the Princess Royal, £5,300 to the two eldest Princesses, and £2,000 to the two youngest, here was a disbursement of £20,000 per annum out of his Civil List towards the maintenance of his royal family more than was paid out of his father's (which, by the bye, was not true, the late King having ever after the quarrel maintained the three eldest Princesses out of his own income to the day of his death; but this blot was not hit by anybody that answered Sir Robert Walpole). Sir Robert having thus answered Mr. Pulteney, laid the great stress of his arguments first on proving that the King could not afford to allow the Prince more than £50,000 per annum; and next, that as the allowing him £100,000 was not mentioned in the Act of Parliament which settles the Civil List, nor even by anybody who spoke on that occasion; and as the Civil List was given to the King unconditionally for life, for the support of the honour and dignity of the Crown and the maintenance of his royal family at his own discretion; so it would be an unjust infringement of the King's legal property for the Parliament to pretend now to appropriate what had been given him without appropriation, and an unreasonable taxing of His Majesty's discretionary power (all circumstances considered) to say or to insinuate that he had not

made a right and proper use of that power in what he now 1737 allowed to the Prince.

There were a great many good things in Sir Robert Walpole's speech, and a great many bad; all the little detail that he entered into of the King's expenses in the establishment of his household was trifling and low, and more like a steward or a housekeeper to a private man than a first minister to a King: all the latter part of what he said was pathetic, eloquent, artful, and great, lamenting as a blow to those who acted on the principles of supporting the Revolution Government that this question was moved at all; and fearing it might prove, considered only as a family dispute between a father and a son, *immedicabile vulnus*, and that a common friend must bewail a dispute where a victory to either might prove ruin to both.

Lord Baltimore, one of the Prince's lords of the chamber, spoke in answer to part of what Sir Robert Walpole had advanced, and said he had the Prince's commands to acquaint the House that from the small allowance the King had made him he had been obliged to run in debt; that he thought £100,000 per annum was what the Parliament had designed him; that his establishment came to £60,000 (which was not true); that he had often made application by the Queen to have his allowance increased (which was not true neither); and that he had told the Lords of the Council so yesterday (which was lie the third). His Royal Highness ordered Mr. Hedges to say the same things that Lord Baltimore had said; and they both of them, that they might not be disavowed afterward by the Prince in what they had said, put His Royal Highness's directions into writing, then asked him if that was what he would have them say, and spoke in the House from that paper.

The Master of the Rolls spoke and acted on this occasion in his usual double, balancing character, for he argued on both sides and voted for neither. The debate lasted till

1737 The next difficulty Sir Robert Walpole lay under was to bring the King to perform what he had promised in his Message, which was the settling a jointure on the Princess and the giving the £50,000 per annum to his son out of his own power to be resumed or stopped.

The King said in common sense or reason everybody, considering when this Message was sent and how it was worded, must look upon it as an offer made by him of accommodation with his son, and these points as articles of treaty on his part to prevent the Prince's bringing this affair to be discussed in Parliament; that since the Prince, notwithstanding, had proceeded, and, like a silly puppy and undutiful, insolent rascal, had brought the question into Parliament, this non-compliance on the part of the Prince with the offer made by His Majesty must be looked upon, the King said, as a release from obligation of performing the conditions on his part, and that he would leave things just where they were.

Sir Robert said that no such condition was actually expressed in the Message, nor had it been so opened or argued upon by those who had pleaded it in Parliament; nor would the Parliament, he feared, any more than the rest of the world, look upon the Message as anything more than a temporary trick to amuse, if the promises therein contained were not performed. And if this matter should another year be brought into Parliament, how would those who had now carried this point for His Majesty by a majority only of thirty be able to support it, divested of those arguments which (he must in justification of the Message say) he believed were the only arguments which could have given His Majesty the victory? He further added, that all that part of mankind who did not cry out against His Majesty receding from what he had promised must at least be silent, for that it was impossible to justify it; neither would His Majesty gain anything by receding, since the allowance to the Prince, whether secured or left at large, could never be stopped;

and that a jointure on the Princess must be given, and the whole world would say ought to be given, let the Prince's behaviour be what it would. 1737

The King said: "I see my affairs, then, are upon that foot that I must yield in everything." And Sir Robert was extremely alarmed and hurt at this answer; looking upon this victory over the King as the King did on his over his son, which was a victory that gave him little pleasure, and was more an indication of future mortification than a subject for present triumph.

Sir Robert Walpole's misfortune at this time was that he had not now the resource he used to have on all other occasions, which was making use of the alkali of the Queen's temper to sweeten the acid of the King's; for Her Majesty needed an alkali to take off the sharpness of her own as much as His Majesty; and Sir Robert found her not as usual an auxiliary on his side, but another opponent he had to conquer: and though he could make the conquest, he apprehended himself to be in the same sort of situation with Louis XII. after the Battle of Ravenna, who said, when he was felicitated on his victory, that such another would ruin him.

There was a council called of all the Prince's friends, a great consultation held, and various opinions (or at least various advices) given concerning the measure of moving the same question in the House of Lords relating to the £100,000 that had been moved in the House of Commons. Those who considered only the Prince's interest and credit advised against exposing him to a second defeat, where the majority would be so much stronger against him than it had been in the first, and which would make the same question, when it should be brought again into the House of Commons, come with less weight. But the Commoners in the Prince's interest not caring to engross all the odium of having pushed this business, and to be the sole objects of the King's resentment, insisted on the same motion being made in the House of Lords

1737 that had been made in the other, that the Peers in this party might be as deeply dipped as themselves; and, in order to carry their point, they persuaded the Prince that since everybody knew it was a measure once taken to move this question in both Houses, that the dropping it in the House of Lords on his defeat in the House of Commons would either be construed fear, or as an acknowledgment of his being in the wrong and giving the thing up.

Feb. 25 The Prince therefore resolved to try his cause likewise in the House of Lords, where Lord Carteret took the lead and made the motion. His introduction was methodized much after the manner of Mr. Pulteney's speech; he pursued the same progress through the English history in examples of the independent settlements of other heirs apparent and presumptive to the Crown; and insisted in the same manner that Mr. Pulteney had done on the design of the Parliament with regard to this £100,000 per annum to the Prince when the Civil List was granted. And though he was guarded in most part of his speech, and seemed determined to give as little offence as was possible on the King's side of the palace at St. James's, yet in the heat of his oratory (though in most parts it was but a cold performance) an expression escaped him which the Queen took mortally ill, and which, as he must know she would do so, I believe he heartily repented afterwards. In speaking of the reasons Edward III. had for making so large a settlement on the Black Prince, he said that great and wise king did it that his son might not be dependent on his minister, his mistress, or his queen; which, as it seemed to put these three characters on the same foot, was a way of arguing that nobody thought very respectful to her present Majesty; and as she was not addicted to think less respect due to the character of a Queen than other people thought belonged to it, she was not more ready to forgive this liberty than those who were less concerned in it were to approve it.

The Duke of Newcastle took upon him to speak after

Lord Carteret, but neither Sir Robert Walpole's example 1737 in public, nor his documents in private, enabled his Grace to answer him. My Lord Chancellor therefore supplied that part, and spoke as well as ever I heard him. Lord Scarborough made use of many strong expressions on this occasion; and to show how much depends on the lips that pronounce, as well as the words that are uttered, he said things with success and applause which if any other body had ventured, they would infallibly have met with censure and disgrace. He said, amongst many other things, that he thought it impossible for the House of Lords, if they had any regard for the King's interest or Government, to give into a motion of this kind; and declared if he was to hear from Persia or China that a Parliament there had carried such a question against the Prince upon the throne in favour of his son, he should conclude the next post would bring the news of the father's being deposed and the son being crowned; and after many more expressions not quite so strongly zested, though but few degrees weaker, he concluded with saying he had spoke the naked sentiments of his heart on this matter to the House, and should sleep the better that night for having communicated his thoughts so freely to their Lordships.

The division in the House of Lords on this question was, for the King 79, Proxies 24, in all 103. For the Prince 28, Proxies 12, in all 40. As the protest on this occasion illustrates still more than I have done the general tenor of the debate upon it, I have transcribed it; and must mention its having been remarked that the words at the end prevented its being signed by any Tories in the division, they not caring to declare it their opinion that under this royal family only they could live free.

Dissentient,—

1. Because this House has an undoubted right to offer, in an humble Address to His Majesty, their sense upon all subjects in which this House shall conceive that the honour and interest of the nation are concerned.

1737 2. Because the honour and interest of the nation, crown, and royal family, can be concerned in nothing more than in having a due and independent provision made for the first-born son and heir-apparent to the crown.

3. Because, in the late King's reign, £100,000 a year, clear of all deductions whatsoever, was settled upon his present Majesty when Prince of Wales, out of a Civil List not exceeding £700,000 a year.

4. Because his present Majesty had granted to him by Parliament several funds to compose a Civil List of £800,000 a year; which, we have very great reason to believe, bring in at least £900,000, and are more likely to increase than to diminish.

5. Because, out of this extraordinary and growing Civil List, we humbly conceive His Majesty may be able to make an honourable provision for the rest of his royal family, without any necessity of lessening that revenue which, in his own case, when he was Prince of Wales, the wisdom of Parliament adjudged to be a proper maintenance for the first-born son and heir-apparent of the crown.

6. Because it is the undoubted right of Parliament to explain the intention of their own Acts, and to offer their advice in pursuance thereof: and though, in the inferior court of Westminster Hall, the Judges can only consider an Act of Parliament according to the letter and express words of the Act, the Parliament itself may proceed in a higher way, by declaring what was their sense in passing it, and on what grounds; especially in a matter recent, and within the memory of many in the House, as well as out of it.

7. Because there were many obvious and good reasons why the sum of £100,000 per annum for the Prince was not specified in the Act passed at that time, particularly his being a minor, and unmarried; but we do apprehend that it is obvious that the Parliament would not have granted to His Majesty so great a revenue above that of the late King but with an intention that £100,000 a year should, at a proper time, be settled on the Prince, in the same manner as it was enjoyed by his royal father when he was Prince of Wales; and His Royal Highness being now thirty years old, and most happily married, we apprehend it can no longer be delayed without prejudice to the honour of the family, the right of the Prince, and intention of the Parliament; and as in many cases the crown is known to stand as trustee for the public upon grants in Parliament, the crown stands as trustee for the Prince for the aforesaid sum.

8. Because we do conceive that the present Princess of Wales ought to have the like jointure that her present Majesty had when

she was Princess of Wales; and that it would be for the honour of the crown that no distinction whatsoever should be made between persons of equal rank and dignity. 1737

9. Because we apprehend that it has always been the policy of this country, and care of Parliament, that a suitable provision, independent of the crown, should be made for the heir-apparent, that, by showing him early the ease and dignity of independence, he may learn by his own experience how a great and free people should be governed; and as we are convinced in our consciences that if this question had been passed in the affirmative, it would have prevented all future uneasiness that may unhappily rise upon this subject, by removing the cause of such uneasiness, and give His Royal Highness what we apprehend to be his right, we make use of the privileges inherent in members of this House to clear ourselves to all posterity from being concerned in laying it aside.

10. Lastly, we thought it more incumbent upon us to insist upon this motion, for the sake of this royal family, under which alone we are fully convinced we can live free, and under the royal family we are fully determined we will live free.

WINCHILSEA and	BRIDGEWATER,
NOTTINGHAM,	BEDFORD,
BERKSHIRE,	WEYMOUTH,
COBHAM,	BATHURST,
CHESTERFIELD,	COVENTRY,
CARDIGAN,	KER,
MARLBOROUGH,	SUFFOLK.
CARTERET,	

People's thoughts were so engaged on the Prince's affair that the debate this year on the continuance of a standing army of near 18,000 men was not much laboured or attended to. The question came into the House of Commons but two days before that on the £100,000, and everybody was so warm on the one that they had no fire to spare for the other, and in the House of Lords there was scarce one single word said upon it. The riots and tumults that had happened this last year in so many parts of the kingdom, and the absolute necessity everybody allowed there had been of calling in the King's forces on these occasions, without which the laws could

Feb. 18

1737 not have been executed or the peace of the kingdom preserved, made the Court party stand upon better ground than usual in arguing for their continuance; since they had it to say that it must certainly encourage these seditious spirits if, before there appeared a greater disposition in them to subside than anybody could yet say there was, any reduction should be made of that force which had been the chief, if not the only, power capable of checking these licentious proceedings, and preventing the nation from falling into anarchy and confusion, and a general dissolution of all government.

Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole he perceived both the King and Queen were less satisfied with his conduct in the Prince's affair than they were apt to be with his behaviour on other points. Sir Robert said he perceived it too, but thought their suspicions of his having had any management or tenderness towards their son were most unjust and unreasonable. "For sure, my Lord," continued he (these were his words), "if ever any man in any cause fought dagger out of sheath, I did so in the House of Commons the day His Royal Highness's affair was debated there." Lord Hervey said, the Duke of Newcastle had certainly talked in his usual palliating style, and hinted to the Queen that the best way of putting an end to this matter was to allow the Prince something more; "and as his Grace is thought to speak your sentiments, Sir, I believe the Queen imagines you have set him to feel her pulse and prepare your way." Sir Robert said: "My Lord, I cannot mend the Duke of Newcastle's understanding; and if he will not believe what I have told him, that that nail will not drive, I cannot help it. But I am determined to have a full explanation with the Queen this very night on all these entangled affairs, and not to let things go on longer in this disagreeable way. And for the Duke of Newcastle, I know him as well as you do, and see very plainly his manner of working; he is linking himself with the Chancellor, and thinks to stand by that

help on his own legs without me." Lord Hervey said 1737 his Grace's conduct was not hard to fathom; and that besides cultivating the Chancellor, his courting the Bishop of Salisbury in the manner he did showed plainly he proposed to keep an interest at Court by the means of the greatest enemy Sir Robert had there; and that the remarkably good correspondence he kept up with Lord Carteret as plainly demonstrated that, as his Grace thought Lord Carteret's a better life than Sir Robert's, he determined not to be desperate with the reversionary Minister any more than with the reigning one, and that the obligations he had to the one could not prevent his turning his eyes towards the other.

Sir Robert Walpole this night told the Queen that, though she knew he was not apt to be suspicious, yet she could not imagine him so insensible as not to perceive some little relaxation in that flood of favour with which she used to receive him; "Nor could I, Madam," said he, "though I were ever so blind in this room, not feel by what passes on the King's side of the house that my good-will towards Your Majesty's service has not the same degree of good fortune it used to meet with. I know when the King speaks his own thoughts, and when he speaks yours; and have not had the honour of serving him and you so long without being able to distinguish between the warm sallies of his own temper when he contradicts me and recedes, and the cooler reasoning objections communicated to him by Your Majesty, which I feel the force of and know by the source from whence they arise that, though they flow with less vehemence, I shall find it much harder to turn their course." The Queen said she had certainly felt very uneasy ever since this affair of her son had been started; and owned that she thought thirty a very small majority, especially since the King had paid so dearly for it, as making the concession he did in the message he had sent the day before this affair came into the House. Sir Robert Walpole desired her she would remember

1737 that all the King had paid was in words, for the Prince had the £50,000 a year before, and to the voters Her Majesty knew it had cost the King but £900. "And where, Madam, there can be nothing but good words and promises on one side, and that they are so profusely lavished, whilst on the other there is nothing given by the King, who has it in his power to give things so much better than words and promises, can you wonder that many fly to your son on this occasion to see what they can get there, though it be only words and promises? Everybody comes to a court to get, and if they find there is nothing to be got in present, it is natural to look out for reversions. Whilst, therefore, the King loses his interest in people by not bestowing what it is in his power to give, your son makes interest by promising what yet is not in his power; and let him be ever so lavish and profuse in these promises, he runs no risk at present, because he can never forfeit his credit for non-performance till the day of payment is come." The Queen said nobody thought that these promises were worth much. Sir Robert replied, that was very true; but everybody who could get no ready money had rather have a bad promissory note than nothing. "However, Madam, I own you must get the better of your son: things are come to that pass that the King must conquer him or be conquered; but consider how that is to be done. I know my Lord Carteret has offered to sell your son to you, and I know the hands through which he has tried to make the bargain with you." The Queen owned to him that Lord Carteret had endeavoured to excuse taking the Prince's part, by sending her word that he was driven to it. "He says," continued the Queen, "that he found you were too well established in my favour for him to hope to supplant you; and, upon finding he could not be first, that he had mortified his pride so far as to take the resolution of submitting to be second; but if you would not permit him even to serve under you, who in this house could blame him if he continued to fight against you?" Sir

Robert said it was impossible the King's business could 1737
go on long with him and Lord Carteret both in the King's
service; that he knew Lord Carteret thoroughly; and that
knowing this was an impracticable scheme, and that a
reconciliation of this kind would be nothing more than
a short introduction to a new rupture, he must beg leave to
tell Her Majesty (as impertinent as it might sound), that
she must take her choice between them; for that he never
could serve with Lord Carteret, but was very ready if she
thought it for her interest and her service to quit. "I know,
Madam," continued Sir Robert, "how indecent it is
generally for a minister and servant of the Crown to talk
in this style, and to say there is anybody with whom he
will not serve. I therefore ask your pardon; but I thought
I should be still more in the wrong if I suffered Your
Majesty to make any agreement with Carteret, and after-
wards quitted your service on that event without having
previously told you I would do so. What I have said,
therefore, Madam, was in order to take the method I
thought most just to Your Majesty, and by which I should
incur the least reproach; and I give Your Majesty my
word I will never speak of quitting again till I do it. I
know, Madam, too," continued he, "that Bishop Sherlock
and Carteret have offered Your Majesty to bring in the
Tories, and fight this battle for you against your son; but
consider before you embark how this matter will stand. In
the first place they cannot answer for the party; in the
next place, if they could, in what manner is this to be done?
Are you to turn out all those who voted for you when you
carried it by thirty, to take in those who voted against you
in order to carry it by a greater majority? How are they
to save appearances in their own conduct but by advising
you to give £20,000 a year more to your son, and will that
quiet him? No: you will then have done what you have
now avoided, and will have your son just as ready to fight
for the rest as he is now, and more able. Besides, Madam,
the very changing your measures is acknowledging a

1737 defeat; if your son forces you to do anything you would not have done without his stirring in this affair, he has conquered. I say he has conquered, for forcing you to change your administration is conquest. You know he said so himself when Mr. Hedges spoke to him on this affair, and tried to divert him from pursuing it in Parliament by telling him it was impossible he could ever get the money. Your Majesty knows his answer was: 'At least I shall show I can do more by opposing than the Opposition have been able to do in sixteen years without me: I shall turn out Walpole, and by showing I have weight enough to make my father change his administration, shall make a much better figure than I can do by being quiet.' Consider, too, Madam, what you would do by taking a Tory administration. You would bring people into your service who never can be in your interest; and the Whig party, which is the natural support of your family, and in my opinion can only support it, you would unite in the interest of your son against you. What is the case of the Whig party? Not that the Tories are too strong for them, for the Whigs are divided, and yet, though divided, support you. Do not flatter yourself then, Madam, that a party that is strong enough in this country to support you though divided will not be strong enough to distress you if you unite them against you. I know the distrust that always attends their way of arguing who argue for themselves, but I think what I have said is so manifestly true, that it must remove that distrust with which I own it is natural Your Majesty on this occasion should hear me. Weigh it, Madam, and make your own determination upon it; at the same time I promise you, let me but do as I will, and you shall conquer this son; and give me leave to say this one thing more, as impertinent as it is to be talking of oneself, that I think it would be a hard fate for a Minister who has served you as I have done, if not with ability at least with such success in all public affairs either foreign or domestic, to be ruined at last by a family quarrel; by your enemies not by your

friends; and by an event I foresaw, by one you know I foretold, and by one I advised you to prevent." Sir Robert Walpole, who came immediately down from the Queen to Lord Hervey's lodgings after this conversation, gave him this account of it, and told Lord Hervey at the same time that he thought what he had said had made all the impression upon her he could desire; for that the Queen had dismissed him with the strongest assurances it was possible to make, of satisfaction in his conduct, and promises to protect and support him. 1737

When the day came that had been appointed by the House of Lords to enter into the examination of the Scotch affair, Lord Carteret, before the provost and bailies of Edinburgh were called to the Bar, proposed a string of questions to the House that he said he thought it was proper these magistrates should be asked in order to clear up this matter and for a groundwork for the House to proceed upon, saying at the same time, though he had done his duty as a member of the House of Lords in bringing this matter before them, yet, now it was there, he should not think himself more obliged than any other Lord in the House to take the lead in the promotion of it; and that those who had the honour to be employed by the Crown, as they must by their station have more lights than other people to go by, in his opinion ought to be the foremost in instructing the House on this occasion, and were doubly bound to sift it to the bottom, as it concerned the honour of the Government by whom they were employed that such an insult to Government should not pass unpunished; and that the honour of the House of Lords was likewise concerned, since they had undertaken this business, to go through with it, and show that they had power to punish the guilty, as well as zeal for the discovery of those who were so.

Lord Carteret's reason for declining an active part for the future in the punishing those concerned in this abominable murder was that he found all parties in

1737 Scotland, however divided in other matters, were united in their desire to have the death of Porteous unrevenged. He therefore reserved all his fire to be played upon the judges when the trial of Porteous should come under consideration, the chief of these judges, which was my Lord Justice Clerk, being a creature of Lord Ilay's, and one whom for that reason Lord Carteret had a mind to fall upon and ruin. My Lord Chancellor, who disliked Lord Ilay, partly upon his own account, from a dispute they had had last year on the Smuggling Bill, and partly from the instigations of the Duke of Newcastle, declared to the House of Lords that he thought the trial of Captain Porteous highly deserved their consideration; for if Porteous had been condemned according to the law of Scotland, he was very sure the law ought to be altered; and if he had not been condemned according to law, he was sure some censure ought to be passed on the judges, and the sentence they had given reversed by Act of Parliament. The Bishop of Salisbury was one of the warmest in the pursuit of both parts of this Scotch business, desiring to revenge on the country and the brother of the Duke of Argyll the affronts which the bishops and clergy of England had received last year from his Grace when the Mortmain and Quakers' Bills were depending.

By the examination of the provost and bailies of Edinburgh, it appeared to the House very plainly that this murder of Porteous was wished by ninety-nine in a hundred throughout all Scotland, and that those who had not been active in it were at best passive, the rumour of such a thing being intended having been universal for many weeks before it was perpetrated, and no measure taken by any magistrate to prevent it. In short, the grossest neglect, not to say connivance, appeared in the magistracy; and the House of Lords was enraged to that degree that, if their anger had been judiciously made use of, the enemies of the Scotch might have led the House of Lords where they pleased.

Lord Hervey was the single English Lord of any 1737 consideration who stuck in every point throughout this affair to the two brothers, the Duke of Argyll and Lord Ilay, and as they were conscious that the same things on this occasion would not come with the same weight out of Scotch lips as out of English, they put him in the front of every skirmish and every battle during the whole progress of this business, and took great pains to instruct him in everything that related to it; and as they had no access to the Queen in private, they depended on him likewise to combat in the palace the representations made there by Bishop Sherlock and the Duke of Newcastle. Sir Robert Walpole, though he had no mind to give up Lord Ilay, mortally hated the Duke of Argyll, and the Duke of Argyll him. This hatred had lately been increased by two accidents. The one was Sir Robert Walpole's having said this year in the House of Commons, in the debate on the army, when he was again reproached with the old story of the disgrace of Lord Cobham and the Duke of Bolton, that any Minister must be a pitiful fellow who would not show military officers that their employments were not held on a surer tenure than those of civil officers, which had been represented to the Duke of Argyll by some in a way as if Sir Robert Walpole had called the military officers pitiful fellows, and by others as if he had said that a Minister must be a pitiful fellow who would suffer military men to meddle out of their province, and concern themselves with civil affairs. The other reason the Duke of Argyll had for feeling additional dislike to Sir Robert Walpole at this time was that he had a mind, on the death of Lord Orkney, to be set at the head of the army, and imputed his not being so to Sir Robert Walpole, though in reality, had Sir Robert loved him as much as he hated him, it would not have been in his power to do it; in the first place, as he had little power in military affairs, and in the next, because the King determined to have nobody at the head of the army but himself, would do everything

1737 there by his own authority, and without any advice, and last of all, because, if His Majesty would have given any authority or taken any advice in these matters, he disliked the Duke of Argyll so much, that he was the last man in England to whom he would have delegated the one, or from whom he would have received the other.

The Duke of Argyll loved his brother Lord Ilay much better than he was beloved by him, and Lord Ilay made the passions of his brother, though he was always condemning him for his heat and his impracticability, of great use to him; for whenever Sir Robert Walpole asked him to do anything he had no mind to, he always pretended to be willing himself, and to lay his not doing it on the impossibility of bringing his hot, obstinate brother to comply with him; and at the same time owned to me that he had had such precaution in the choice of those men whom he had brought into either House of Parliament, that, knowing his brother's violence and sudden turns (these were his words), "I have contrived it so that if my brother should run mad, and break with the Court, there are not three people in Parliament who will follow him unless I go along with them."

At this time Lord Ilay and Lord Hervey on one hand were always telling Sir Robert Walpole that Lord Chancellor and the Duke of Newcastle were laying schemes to govern independently of him, and that they were certainly in good intelligence with Sherlock and Carteret; whilst on the other hand the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Chancellor were telling him that the House of Lords and the nation expected Scotland should receive some punishment for such a behaviour, and that Lord Ilay and Lord Hervey were so obstinate that they would come into nothing, though all the rest of the King's servants were so desirous some censure might be passed, and some mark of the resentment of the Legislature shown on this occasion, that it was certainly as little for the interest of the King as for

the honour of the House of Lords to let such an outrage 1737 go off with impunity.

Lord Ilay told Sir Robert he would consent to any punishment being inflicted on Scotland but such a one as would make the whole nation disaffected, and render the government of it quite impracticable; that my Lord Chancellor abused Scotland every day in such strong invectives, and behaved himself with such pride and such arrogance, that there was really no temper could bear it with patience; that if Sir Robert would suffer it, Lord Ilay said he must quit and give up the whole, for that he would not continue in the King's service only to irritate people against him, when he had neither power enough to defend himself, nor interest enough to engage others to do it. He said Lord Hervey was the only man almost in the King's service that did not talk and act as if Scotland was to be torn to pieces for this transaction, and desired Sir Robert Walpole to consider well before things were brought to that pass as to force Scotland into a rebellion, and whether, for the sake of Lord Chancellor's and the Duke of Newcastle's pique to him, he would resolve for the future to rule Scotland upon the foot of a conquered country; for that must be the case if he ruled it at all, and things were suffered to go on in the violent track the House of Lords seemed to be pursuing at present.

In the palace the Queen was beset by the Duke of Newcastle and Bishop Sherlock on one hand, and Lord Hervey on the other, in the same manner that I have described Sir Robert Walpole; but Sir Robert Walpole not being very well at present with the Duke of Newcastle, and always hating Sherlock, the Queen was brought to think that the less was done on this occasion to punish Scotland, provided anything was done, the better.

The method of proceeding occasioned as much difficulty as the matter. This affair first being taken up in the House of Lords made an impeachment impossible, unless the House of Lords had dropped it entirely, and that the

1737 prosecution were left to begin *de novo* in the House of Commons. Formerly, the House of Lords in cases like these used to order the Attorney-General to exhibit articles, and proceed in that manner, but this method being now obsolete, it was not judged proper to revive it. The third and only way there was besides of proceeding was by Bill, and this was the method resolved upon. The substance of the Bill, as Lord Chancellor had first framed it, was to disable the provost and the four bailies of Edinburgh from ever holding any office in Great Britain, and to imprison them, and to pull down one of the gates of Edinburgh called the Nether-Bow Port, in order to leave a free and open access at all times to the King's troops to enter the town whenever they should be called for. The provost not being a friend of Lord Ilay's, he did not care much what they did with him; but the four bailies being all men whom he had put in and protected, he was very solicitous to save them. Lord Ilay came to Lord Hervey and told him what he wished, and Lord Hervey assured him he would not vote for the Bill if they were left in; but desired Lord Ilay, in order to enable him to prevail with the Queen to have them left out, to consent to the taking away the town-guard in lieu of punishing the bailies. Lord Ilay did consent, and Lord Hervey told the Queen this was an exchange that would be greatly for the advantage of the Government; for that it would be of no use to the Government to punish shoemakers and cheesemongers, but of great utility to get rid of a guard which was for ever made a pretence to hinder the entrance of the King's forces, and was a guard so constituted that when they were in the hands of the friends to the Government they were of no more use than the worst of militia, and whenever they had been at the direction of the enemies to the Government had been put upon the foot of the best disciplined troops. "To what purpose, then, or with what policy," said he, "can the Court desire to continue the use of a weapon which has always been blunt when employed for you, and

pointed when it has been directed against you?" Lord 1737
Hervey told Her Majesty, too, that though he believed, in case she desired him to bring off anybody that was guilty, he should certainly do it, yet he neither could nor would upon any account join in punishing anybody as guilty that he did not think was so; and let the provost be ever so guilty, and the bailies have been ever so passive, yet, as they had no authority to give orders when the provost was present, so he could no more in justice and conscience vote for the punishing them on this occasion than he could vote for punishing subalterns in an army for not commanding when their general was present. The Queen consenting to this exchange, and Lord Hervey declaring to Lord Chancellor and the Duke of Newcastle he would oppose the Bill in every step if the bailies were inserted, they were left out, and the abolishing the town-guard was a clause put in instead of the other.

The Duke of Argyll opposed the bringing in of the Bill, and every step it took in its progress. One of the reasons he gave for doing so, which he dwelt much upon and often repeated, I own was a very impudent one; since it was from a pretended opinion of being in general against all bills of this sort, though there never had been a Bill of Pains and Penalties since he sat in the House for which he had not voted, and some he had even brought in; and this, though everybody knew, yet nobody had courage to say in answer to him. Lord Ilay neither spoke nor voted on any of the questions that arose in the progress of the Bill, thinking himself obliged, since he had by a sort of compromise consented in private council to the bringing it in so mitigated, not to oppose it, and not daring, for the sake of his interest in Scotland, to be for it even so mitigated. Lord Hervey, though he voted for the Bill for the same reasons that Lord Ilay did not oppose, spoke at the bringing it in very long and vehemently against Bills of Pains and Penalties in general, abusing every one that had ever passed in Parliament, from that against Lord Strafford

1737 in King Charles I.'s reign, down to the present times. For this reason, though he concluded his speech with saying he acquiesced under this Bill, as the only way every lord in the House agreed there was now of punishing this atrocious crime committed in Scotland, yet everybody who was for the Bill reproached him with having said as much against it as anybody who had voted against it. Lord Chancellor answered Lord Hervey, and justified the Bill in all its parts with such a parental partiality that nobody who heard him could be at a loss to guess who was the political father of the parliamentary child. There were several debates on this Bill, in which the Duke of Argyll and Lord Chancellor had several disputes, carried on with as great decency as if there had been no rancour and, to a discerning eye, with as much rancour as if there had been no decency. All of the sixteen Scotch Peers that were present, except Lord Ilay, who did not vote at all, voted for the bringing in of the Bill; but after a second reading, when counsel was heard against it, they all voted against it, pretending to have changed their opinion on what they had then heard, though there was not one single thing said at that time that had not been said before, one single piece of evidence invalidated, or one circumstance in any one fact that I remember differently stated. My old Lord Findlater, with a little insignificant knowledge in the civil law, and my young Lord Crawford, without any knowledge at all, made so many long, dull, absurd speeches in broad Scotch against the Bill that they fretted everybody who was of their side, exasperated everybody that was against them, and made the two parties of a mind in nothing but wishing them dumb. In short, the Bill passed the House

May 11 of Lords framed as I have before related, for disabling the provost and imprisoning him for a year, for abolishing the city-guard, and taking down the Nether-Bow Port.

During the examination that preceded the bringing in this Bill it appeared that my Lord Justice-Clerk had

refused sending an order to General Moyle for the King's 1737
troops to march, when Moyle, on Lindsay's coming to
him during the tumult, had sent to the Lord Justice-Clerk
to demand one. Those who were warmest in this prosecution
took hold of this circumstance to move the House of
Lords, at ten o'clock at night, after a long examination *Mar. 18*
that had set the House in a situation which the anti-
Scotland men thought fitted them for any violent step,
that my Lord Justice-Clerk should be immediately sent
for up from Scotland. Lord Lovel moved this, and was
seconded by the Duke of Montagu, whose zeal against
Scotland opened a mouth that had been shut for fifty odd
years, and which (like that of Balaam's ass) now opened
for the last time as well as the first. The Duke of
Richmond, Lord Pembroke, Lord Delaware, and several
others in the first employments at Court, were very zealous
in this question. Lord Ilay spoke against it, and said: "If,
my Lords, it is only on account of my Lord Justice-Clerk
not sending the order to Moyle that he is to be sent for up,
I declare he was in the right, my Lord Justice-Clerk
having no authority I know of to send such an order; and
had I been there myself, who am the first Criminal Judge
in Scotland,¹ I would not have sent it. When I am absent
my Lord Justice-Clerk is the first Judge; and I know no
law in Scotland to oblige, or even to justify, his sending
such an order; I hope, therefore, your Lordships will not
put such an indignity on an innocent man as to send for
him as a criminal for not doing what he would have been
criminal if he had done." This did not satisfy the warm
men: they argued in general that the honour of the House
of Lords was concerned to sift this matter to the bottom;
that it was the deepest and darkest scene of villainy that
had ever been concerted in any country; that the House of
Lords wanted more light; and that my Lord Justice-Clerk
could possibly give them more, as he was in so great a
station, and plainly appeared to have had a part, whether

¹Lord Ilay was Lord Justice-General of Scotland.

1737 innocent or guilty, in this transaction; and therefore they insisted on the motion made to bring him.

Lord Hervey, who was the first Englishman who opposed this motion, said he desired the House of Lords would a little consider, before they sent for a man in so high a station from Scotland, on what foot it was to be done. "I desire to know," continued he, "before I can give my consent to this motion, that it may be explained whether my Lord Justice-Clerk is to be sent for as a criminal or as an evidence, or merely to satisfy the curiosity of the House of Lords. If as a criminal, let the crime be specified and the charge laid; if as an evidence he is to come, I desire to know to what fact; and if out of curiosity he is to be sent for, I do not think it is very prudent to send for a man of that rank on such light motives, or that it is treating Scotland with a due respect to send for the first Judge at present in the country in such a manner, or that it is likely to give the people a due regard for the laws of their country, when they see a man at the head of those laws treated with so little regard by the House of Lords. Besides, may it not be suspected that, as the magistrates of Edinburgh were sent for upon suspicion only, and that a charge of guilt is now exhibited against them, founded contrary in most cases (I will not arraign the proceedings of the House of Lords by saying in all cases) to the first rules of natural justice, by making their own confession (and a confession extorted from them) the groundwork of that charge; and if this has been done with regard to the magistrates, may not the people of Scotland apprehend the same thing is going to be done with the chief of their judges? I do therefore think that before your Lordships have determined whether you will send for this great magistrate as a criminal, or a witness, or an informer, and settled as to what facts in any of these cases he is to be examined, it is highly improper to send for him at all."

These were the heads on which Lord Hervey preached in opposition to this motion. Lord Chancellor did not say

my Lord Justice-Clerk ought not to be sent for, but said, 1737
if it should be found necessary to examine him, that he
thought, as Lord Hervey had urged, it would be proper
first for the House to determine on what points, and con-
sequently that he hoped the motion would be withdrawn
that night, in order to give the House time to weigh the
reasons for coming into such a resolution. The Duke of
Newcastle, who took no share in this debate till Lord
Chancellor had spoke, having neither courage enough to
follow his inclination in supporting the question, nor to do
his duty in opposing it, repeated as well as he could what
Lord Chancellor had said; but Lord Chancellor himself
neither having been, nor desiring to be, very clear on the
subject, when the Duke of Newcastle's puzzled concep-
tion came with a puzzled utterance to endeavour to
echo him, he made such abominable confused work of
it, as made even confusion surprise, though it came out
of his lips. On the division it was carried against the
motion.¹

This happening on a Friday night and Sir Robert Wal-
pole, as usual, passing Saturday and Sunday at Newpark,
the Duke of Newcastle went thither from Claremont and
told Sir Robert that though they had been able on Friday
to prevent my Lord Justice-Clerk being sent for, it was
only by saying the resolution would have too precipitate
an air if taken that night; and that it would be impossible
to prevent its being carried the next week. His Grace took
Lord Chancellor with him to talk in the same style; and as
Sir Robert Walpole was brought by their reports to be-
lieve this was the case, Sir Robert said it would be better
to yield in this matter than to be beaten, and that it was
more advisable for everybody of our side to move that my
Lord Justice-Clerk and two other Judges should attend
to give information to the House on points of Scotch law,
the trial of Porteous being then under consideration, than

¹The division was on a motion for the adjournment moved by the Duke
of Argyll.

1737 that the enemy should get him up alone, or on any other pretence.

This was agreed to by Lord Ilay, whom Sir Robert sent for immediately to consult; at the same time he sent a message to Lord Hervey to desire him to meet him early on Monday morning at his return to London. When Lord Hervey came to Sir Robert's he found Lord Ilay there, and as soon as he was acquainted with the resolution that had been taken began to abuse Lord Ilay for being such a fool to agree to it, asking him if anybody, after standing a battle and gaining a victory, ever gave up what they had fought for, and why he suffered Sir Robert Walpole to be imposed upon by such strange misrepresentations; telling them both at the same time that he had made the King and Queen declare themselves publicly against all these hot, violent proceedings, and that my Lord Ilay and Sir Robert were going to do that against themselves which their enemies had tried to do in vain. Lord Hervey then asked Sir Robert Walpole if he had taken the resolution to submit to that government which he had long told him the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Chancellor were usurping; and if Sir Robert would never make use of his own power and his own understanding, but commit the one perpetually into the hands of those to whom he could not give the other. Sir Robert said: "They don't govern me, nor they shan't govern me; but you hate the Duke of Newcastle, and therefore never will imagine it possible he can do anything right. I see what he is about as plain as you do, but I am not prejudiced; and you see Lord Ilay has consented to this step, and approves it." "I acquiesce" (interrupted Lord Ilay), "but I assure you I am far from approving, and only consent because I am weary of dissenting to no purpose."

Mar. 22 In short, the Duke of Newcastle got the better of Lord Hervey, and this motion was made next day in the House by the Duke of Newcastle, to the great triumph of those who were now running riot on this Scotch scent, and hoped

to bring disgrace on Lord Ilay. Lord Carteret spoke after 1737 the Duke of Newcastle, and said he was very glad to find his Grace on more mature deliberation had found out the propriety of doing what he had opposed on Friday; and, with some banter on the fluctuation of the Court measures, said it was never too late to do right; adding, too, that he was sure, whatever might have been said of my Lord Justice-Clerk's being sent for by a message on Friday, might just as well be said upon it though it went on a Tuesday; that the alteration in the day would make none in the disgrace, if there was any disgrace incurred; and that for his part he was consistent in his conduct on both days, and uniform in his opinion, and therefore seconded his Grace's motion.

The Duke of Newcastle said nothing at all by way of reply; but Lord Hervey took notice that there was not all that inconsistency which Lord Carteret would insinuate in the conduct of those who had voted against the motion made on Friday, and yet were for the motion proposed to-day; there being a very essential difference between calling my Lord Justice-Clerk alone to the bar as a criminal, and the desiring his presence, with two other judges, to give the House instruction in the Scotch law, in the same manner the English judges were there to give their opinions to the Lords on points relating to the English law; as in one case it was sending for him to answer for his conduct to the superior power of the Lords, in the other to regulate the conduct of the Lords by his superior knowledge. His Lordship expatiated a good deal on these distinctions, which to be sure, were nothing more than distinctions in words; for in reality the enemies of Lord Ilay and my Lord Justice-Clerk had in this circumstance carried their point, and brought thus far all the disgrace on these two men that they had aimed at; which was showing the world that the one stood in need of protection, and that the other had not credit enough at present to give it him.

1737 Lord Hervey, however, had better success in the impressions he tried to make on the Queen on this occasion than on Sir Robert. She took Lord Ilay's part very warmly, and said she would not positively have him given up, nor coolly supported; and though they had, by a jumble she did not understand, brought up these Scotch judges, that they should not be treated with disrespect. She sent for the Duke of Newcastle and schooled him very severely. "What the devil," said the Queen to him, "signifies all this bustle about the Scotch judges? Will worrying the Scotch judges be any satisfaction to the King for the insult offered to the Government in the murder of Porteous? Will that tend to bring any of the offenders concerned in that crime to justice? Will it be any atonement for what is passed, or strengthen the hands of the Government in order to prevent such outrages for the future? It is just in the same style as your silly proposal to put the bailies into the Bill; and I must say the King has great obligations to Lord Hervey, who insisted, instead of punishing the bailies, which would have done the King no good, to take away their nasty town-guard, which will be a real good to the Government. Believe me, my Lord, I understand all this very well; you hate Lord Ilay and you want to take this occasion to do disagreeable things to him, and make it impossible for him to carry on the King's business in Scotland. But Lord Ilay has been too good a servant to the King for the King to let any such schemes take effect; he will support my Lord Ilay, and will, I assure you, take it very ill of anybody who goes about to hurt him. The business of Princes is to make the whole go on, and not to encourage or suffer little, silly, impertinent, personal piques between their servants to hinder the business of the Government being done; there will always be opposition enough given by the enemies of the King to his measures and his Ministers; and you may depend upon it he will never bear it from those who ought to be his friends. You comprehend me very well, and I hope we shall have

no more of this childish fiddle-faddle silly work." The 1737 Duke of Newcastle said that my Lord Chancellor had told him that Captain Porteous was very unjustly condemned, and that it would be a shame for the Legislature if such a scandalous trial was before the House of Lords and passed without any animadversion. The Queen replied: "My Lord, you have drawn my Lord Chancellor into this business, and now you want to lay the fault upon him. It is certainly just that Scotland should receive some punishment for the abominable murder that has been committed there; but there is no reason why the Scotch should be exasperated by drawing into that punishment men of figure and rank in their country who had nothing to do with it, only to make this affair more national than it need be, which is just what those who oppose the Court want to bring about, and what those who serve the King wisely and faithfully would avoid. In short, I do not like this meddling with the Scotch judges. I think my Lord Ilay an excellent servant to the King, and that the complaint he makes is a very just one—that, whilst he is attacked by the enemies of the King's Government for having served the King steadily and thoroughly, the King's servants who ought to defend him are running upon him too."

As I wrote down this conversation immediately after the Queen gave me an account of it, which was the same day it was held, I believe it is very exact.

The Queen sent also for Bishop Sherlock, and talked to him much in the same strain, adding that she knew his reason for taking part so warmly in this prosecution; that it was to revenge his church-quarrels, and to wound the Duke of Argyll through Lord Ilay's side; but she desired him to consider he was wounding the Government too. "And believe me, my Lord," continued the Queen, "this zeal for punishment does not become your profession; and all this bustle about the Scotch law, how does it come à propos to your character, unless it is to show that you

1737 have lived so long at the Temple?¹ You know I wish you well, and I am sorry you so often give a handle to those who wish you ill to say how troublesome you make the King's business to those who are concerned in it; and I beg, my Lord, you would not make me, who am always ready to excuse your conduct, find it so often necessary to give you up."

As these reprimands, given by the Queen to these two men, had very different spirits to work upon, as well as men in very different situations, the one being Secretary of State, and the other Bishop of Salisbury, upon very different tenures, so these reprimands and admonitions had very different effects. The Duke of Newcastle was frightened, changed his conduct, and receded; the Bishop of Salisbury was undaunted, justified his conduct, and persevered. Lord Hervey told the Duke of Argyll and Lord Ilay how strenuously the Queen espoused their cause, and let the Queen know he had done so, and at the same time assured her how sensible they were of her favours, and how gratefully they spoke of them. "You know," said the Queen, "I have not always loved my Lord Ilay much; but I assure you I have a great opinion of his ability, and know he has been so useful to the King that I have got over all my silly prejudices; and for the Duke of Argyll, I don't know what is come to him; for though he hardly ever used to come near me, and when he did come did not do me the honour to look at me, I now see him every day, and with a *douceur*, that it is as if he was fallen in love *tout d'un coup* with my wrinkles and my grey hairs." Lord Hervey said this change was easily accounted for. "The Duke of Argyll thought formerly that neither the King nor Your Majesty cared for him, and when people have things given them without being loved, it is no wonder they receive them without being obliged; but as Your Majesty's behaviour in these Scotch affairs has shown you are no

¹Sherlock was Master of the Temple, and made it his usual town residence till his promotion to London.

enemy to the name of Campbell, his Grace desires to show 1737
he can feel favours as well as receive benefits."

When the day came that had been appointed by the House of Lords for taking the trial of Captain Porteous into consideration, Lord Carteret, who, thinking he should have the Duke of Newcastle, my Lord Chancellor, and the Bishop of Salisbury of his side, had studied the point thoroughly, laboured it in the House in a very long speech. He entered into a disquisition of the criminal law of Scotland, and pointed out many particulars in which he said it bore so hard upon the subject that it ought to be amended; and he then endeavoured to show that the Scotch judges in this trial had been so hard upon Porteous, that they had even stretched the law, which was of itself too hard, in order to condemn him; but, after all this, concluded without making any motion, saying he had only laid his thoughts on these matters before the House, and left it to their Lordships' wisdom and discretion to do what they thought fit, without pretending to advise or direct them.

Lord Hervey, who had been instructed for this purpose by Lord Ilay and one Erskine (soon after made Lord-Advocate of Scotland), an admirable good lawyer, answered Lord Carteret, drawing a parallel between the criminal law of Scotland and England, and showing how in many points the criminal law of Scotland was more favourable to the subject than that of England. He showed, also, that in many particulars Lord Carteret had advanced he had misrepresented the law of Scotland; and then endeavoured to prove that the judges, to act conformable to the law and practice of the criminal courts in Scotland, could have done nothing on the trial of Porteous but just what they did. Bishop Sherlock spoke after Lord Hervey, and made a very fine oration, tending to inflame his audience first against the Scotch judges, and then against Scotland in general; but there was little or no argument in anything he advanced. Lord Ilay spoke after Sherlock,

1737 and abused his ignorance in facts, and his indecency in descanting on them, very freely. He spoke a great while; but having given the greatest part of his ammunition to Lord Hervey, and not caring to repeat what had been said by him, he did not speak (his abuse on Sherlock excepted) so well as usual. The Duke of Newcastle was quite silent; and my Lord Chancellor, after expatiating a great while on what had been advanced against the English law by Lord Hervey, and against the Scotch law by Lord Carteret, said that to be sure there was no body of laws, nor no forms of law, to which some objections might not be found; but alterations in standing laws, or in long usage, ought never to be made without the most mature deliberation; and therefore declared he was very glad Lord Carteret had concluded without any motion, as that would give the Lords time to receive information from the Scotch judges before it would be necessary to receive or reject any proposal that should be made for any change in the laws of that country. He owned, too, that he had been of opinion that the first interlocutor in the trial of Porteous had borne very hard upon him, thinking it had circumscribed him within much narrower bounds in making his defence than he found it did when he came to read and consider the evidence Captain Porteous in consequence of that interlocutor had been allowed to give. He therefore concluded with saying that, though he still thought that interlocutor very inaccurately penned, yet he did not retain the opinion he had at first conceived of the judges not having left all the scope to Captain Porteous's evidence that justice and equity required, or that the criminal himself could desire. So this day's debate was finished without anything being done, and even without anything being proposed to be done.

When the questions relating to points of Scotch law, and arising from circumstances contained in the trial of Porteous, were to be put to the Scotch judges, great disputes arose in the House about the manner in which

the judges should be admitted. Some were for having the Scotch, like the English judges, brought by the King's writ upon the Woolsack; but my Lord Chancellor starting a difficulty whether the Crown had a legal right to summon them in this manner, that proposal was laid aside. The only remaining dispute then was, whether they should be heard, in the common way of all other examinations, at the bar, or have the distinction shown them of being brought to the table—a compliment that had been paid (as appeared on the journals) in some few instances. There was a long debate and a division on this question, but it was carried for the bar; however, Lord Ilay and Lord Hervey had the satisfaction of seeing the Queen's lecture to the Duke of Newcastle had had so good an effect that he did not dare to vote with the majority, but was forced to sneak out with them in the minority. So the Scotch judges were called to the bar, and there interrogated.

The next day the Duke of Argyll moved the House that, as the law of England was so very doubtful in some points relating to the conduct of the soldiery, the judges might be asked how far an officer would be justified in using force when called in aid of the civil power by the civil magistrate; how far the officer was safe in obeying that authority; or if he was safe in refusing to obey it. When the House consented to these questions, and some more of the like nature, being put to the English judges, the Bishop of Salisbury, who had a mind to give the Scotch judges the trouble, and, as he thought, the disgrace, of being brought again to the bar of the House of Lords, moved that these questions might also be put to the Scotch judges. Some other Lord (I have forgot whom) moved that the Scotch judges might deliver their opinion in writing. With this proposal Lord Ilay closed, saying it would not then be necessary for them to appear but to send their opinions to be read by the clerks; and Lord Hervey moved that, as there were only three of the Scotch judges in England, they might not be debarred of the same

1737 advantages the English judges had, of consulting the rest of their brethren on such important as well as doubtful points, but that they might have leave to go down into Scotland again, in order to consult their records as well as their brother judges, and to give the House the best information that could be had on these questions. The Bishop of Salisbury, who saw Lord Hervey's drift, opposed this motion, and said it would sound very odd for the House of Lords to send for the Scotch judges up from Scotland only to ask them questions relating to the Scotch law, and then to send them back again to Scotland to answer them. Lord Hervey replied that there would be no inconsistency at all in this conduct, because the words of the order of the House by which the Scotch judges were sent for were to inform the House with regard to the trial of Porteous, which he supposed the Bishop had forgot; and as he concluded these judges, before they came, had taken the opinions of the other judges, and made themselves masters of the points in that trial which they were called to explain, and had in consequence of these steps given the House thorough satisfaction, so on this new point, for which they were not called, and for which, to be sure, they were not prepared, he hoped the same advantages would be allowed them by the House, and doubted not but in that case the same satisfaction would be given to the House. Lord Hervey's proposal for these reasons was agreed to, and the Scotch judges in two or three days after set out on their return to Scotland, getting their release and their quietus by this turn being given to a motion made by one who wished only to give them new trouble, and expose them to repeated disgrace; and for this service the three Scotch judges came next morning to St. James's to return Lord Hervey their thanks.

Lord Carteret came to Lord Hervey after the debate was over, and told him: "Well, my Lord, you have outwitted the Bishop." Lord Hervey said he had only convinced him. "You have convinced," replied Lord Carteret,

"the Duke of Newcastle too." Lord Hervey smiled, 1737 and said he believed other people had convinced him. "You saw," said Lord Carteret, "I found how it went, and made my retreat. Whilst Lord Chancellor and the Duke of Newcastle went along with me, I thought I could deal with you; but when my Lord Chancellor came to find fault with the style of the judges instead of their conduct, and to say the interlocutor was only inaccurately penned, I found my Lord Ilay and you had got the better of him and the Duke of Newcastle at St. James's; and when I felt how matters stood, I retired too." "But if this was your opinion," said Lord Hervey, "how came you not to let your friend Sherlock into the secret? Why did not you tell him that half the pack and those hounds on whom you most depended were drawn off, and the game escaped and safe, instead of leaving his Lordship there to bark and yelp by himself, and make the silly figure he has done?" "Oh!" said Lord Carteret, "he talks like a parson; and consequently is so used to talk to people that don't mind him, that I left him to find it out at his leisure, and shall have him again for all this whenever I want him." Such speeches require so little commenting upon that I never affront my readers so much as to add any reflections or explanations to things which speak their own sense so plainly that I could suggest nothing which would not be anticipated by their own imagination before I could mention them.

After this affair of the judges was over, the Queen told Lord Hervey she should be glad to know the truth, but believed she should never come at it, whether the Scotch judges had been really to blame or not in the trial of Captain Porteous. "For between you and the Bishop of Salisbury," said she, "who each of you convince me by turns, I am as much in the dark as if I knew nothing at all of the matter. He comes and tells me they are all as black as devils; you, that they are as white as snow, and whoever speaks last I believe. I am like that judge you talk of so often in the play (Gripus, I think you call him), that, after

1737 one side had spoke, begged t'other might hold their tongue, for fear of puzzling what was clear to him. I am Queen Gripus; and, since the more I hear the more I am puzzled, I am resolved I will hear no more about it; but let them be in the right or the wrong, I own to you I am glad they are gone."

Mar. 21 Whilst these Scotch affairs were going on in the House of Lords, a scheme was proposed by Sir John Barnard (one of the City members in the Opposition) to reduce the interest of the National Debt to three per cent., a proposal evidently so beneficial to the national interest, and that of the landed men, that it was at first received in the House with all the applause and satisfaction imaginable.

For private and personal and perhaps ministerial reasons Sir Robert Walpole tried to stop it, but could not, and a Bill was ordered to be brought in to put the scheme in execution. Sir Robert had, I believe, two reasons for endeavouring to defeat this project; one, the envying Sir John Barnard the honour and popularity of doing what seemed more naturally the business of the First Commissioner of the Treasury, and of him who was at the head of the management of the revenue; the other, the fear of disobliging the moneyed men in the House of Commons by giving in to a scheme that was at once to lop off a fourth part of their income. The first of these reasons it is easy to imagine he would own to nobody, and the last he could only own in private. He told the King and Queen that this scheme, if it took effect, would have very bad consequences; for, though it was not proposed by him, yet, as everybody would imagine it could not be carried through without his consent and acquiescence, so it would certainly make many of the moneyed men, who now served the Court for nothing, turn against them. Sir Robert Walpole told them, too, that though he confessed a saving of £500,000 a year, unappropriated and ready for any exigence or to spare the land for the current service, was a very desirable thing for the Government, yet, as that £500,000 must come out of

many people's pockets, so most of those who paid their 1737 quota to it would look upon the Government as the occasion of their being pinched to furnish it; that this would so vastly increase the disaffection in the nation, that he did not know what turn it might take or what consequences it might have; and as things of this nature should always be done gradually to be done safely, so it could never be the interest of any Government to stand the shock of doing them wantonly at a jerk, when the Government was not in immediate want of the money, and when it was at best only for public good, which nobody was ever thanked for, and when it would be evidently to the detriment and loss of so many particulars, of which (let who will be to blame) the Government always incurred all the clamour and the odium. These arguments and suggestions were sufficient to make the King and Queen zealous in desiring this project should be defeated; and as they were both of them extremely free in publicly declaring themselves against it, most people imagined Their Majesties' reason for being so warm was their having a great deal of money in the funds, and their choosing the nation should rather continue to pay four per cent. interest instead of three for a debt of near fifty millions than that they should receive three per cent. instead of four for their private treasure.

The arguments used against this proposal, considering it only in a national light, were so weak and so absurd that I am almost ashamed to mention them; but let anything ever so beneficial be proposed for the benefit of the public, if particulars are to be prejudiced by such a proposal, those particulars will always exclaim against it, yet never confess it is on their own particular account they do so, which might be excused, but pretend it is for the sake of the public, which can never be believed. Those, therefore, who knew their income must be lessened a fourth part by this reduction of the national interest, instead of giving their true and natural reason against this project by saying they had rather the Government should not retrench its

1737 expenses than that they should be obliged to retrench theirs, went about saying that this reduction was contrary to national faith, and would ruin the national credit; and when it was answered that the public had, by contract with their creditors, a right to pay its debts whenever it was able, it was answered the public had a right to redeem, but not to reduce. To this the espousers of the reducing scheme replied that there was nothing obligatory in the reduction, and all that was desired was to ask the creditors of the public whether they would be contented to take three per cent. for their principal, which nobody pretended the public had a right to force them to take, or whether they would have their principal paid them, which everybody knew the public had a right to force them to take whenever the public had it to give. This appearance of an option, it was said by those who argued against the project for reduction, was unjust, because in reality it was no option, the public, in case the creditors chose to have their principal, not having money in their hands to give what was chosen. This proposal, therefore, of a seeming option, it was said, would only be a method the Parliament would take to fright those public creditors into consenting to a reduction whom the Parliament could not compel to submit to one; and, as Sir Robert Walpole rather ingeniously than truly expressed it, would be like a hawk in the air, which, though it did not destroy the birds, made them lie quiet whilst the net was thrown over them, in which, without that terror, they would never have been taken. All these objections of injustice were certainly fully answered by those who were for this project asserting that the Parliament had indisputably not only a right, but were by duty bound, as trustees for the public, not to pay four per cent. for money they could have at three. It was said, too, that, if an option given to the creditors, whether they would have their principal-money or continue creditors at three per cent., was thought a hardship on the creditors, or an iniquity when it was meant as a favour, the giving that

option might be omitted; and all that was contended for was 1737
this plain simple method—that subscription-books might
be opened by authority of Parliament at the Exchequer,
and everybody at liberty to subscribe what money they
thought fit into those books at three per cent. If the sub-
scription did not fill, the public would only be in the same
situation it was at present, the Parliament having done its
duty by trying to get money as cheap as it was to be had;
and if it did fill, the Parliament, as fast as that money at
three per cent. was subscribed in, might discharge the
debts of the public that were now standing out at four.

There being no possibility of combating in general the
reasonableness of this proposal, the Bill, as I have said be-
fore, was ordered by a great majority to be brought in; but *Mar. 30*
Sir Robert Walpole, whilst the Bill was drawing and pre-
paring, having time to go about to talk to people, to solicit,
to intimidate, to argue, to persuade, and perhaps to bribe,
so managed matters, by changing his battery from finding
fault with the proposal into attacking the manner of
executing it, by not saying one word against the design of
the Bill but exploding the scheme of it, by passing over
in silence the propriety of such a Bill yet showing or
endeavouring to show the impracticability of executing
this project in the way the several clauses of this Bill tended
to put it in execution, by making use of all his oratory to
persuade and all his Exchequer knowledge to puzzle,
that this Bill, after his talking for above two hours in a *April 29*
debate that lasted many more, was most unaccountably, on
the second reading, thrown out by very near as great a
majority as it was ordered to be brought in.

What were Sir Robert Walpole's real and private reasons
for acting this part on this occasion, I shall not pretend to
determine. Whether, as I have said before, he grudged
Sir John Barnard the reputation of being the first mover
of this public benefit, and therefore resolved to defeat it;
whether he was afraid of having it said, whilst he had the
demerit and the discredit of having never reduced the

1737 principal of the National Debt, that another had the merit at least of reducing the interest; whether he had great sums of money himself in the funds, and prevented the scheme for that reason taking place; or whether he apprehended, as he told the King and Queen, that several moneyed men, who had stood by them in the question relating to the Prince's £100,000 without any reward, would leave the Court in that and all other questions if not indulged in the defeat of this scheme; I say, which of these reasons, or what other reasons, or whether all these and other reasons joined, influenced Sir Robert on this occasion, I know not; but some strong reasons undoubtedly he must have to act contrary to the opinion and advice of most of his friends, to labour such an uphill game in Parliament, and to forego such an opportunity of saving near £500,000 a year of the interest now paid for the National Debt and having that sum ready on any exigence to be employed for the service of the Government, without laying any new tax upon the people. Yet this would evidently have been the case; for if two millions are now paid for the National Debt at four per cent., and that interest was reduced to three, it is plain, supposing the whole debt now to be at four per cent., the saving on that reduction would be £500,000 a year to the public; so that what the saving would be less than that sum would be in proportion only to those parts of the debt that are already at three per cent.

Mr. Pulteney acted a very mean part on this occasion, first pretending to be for the reduction of interest, then saying he was only for it on a supposition that a reduction of taxes was to be the immediate consequence of it, and, in short, talking and acting in such a manner as let all the world see that, after bellowing for the public and professing patriotism for so many years together, he was governed by his private interest (a great part of his estate being in the funds) as much as any of those poor pensioned commoners whom he had so often in his philippics abused,

and called the corrupt tools of a Minister, or the hireling slaves to a Court. To his wife's importunity it was thought his conduct on this occasion was in a great measure owing, she having a good deal of money of her own separate fortune in the stocks, and being of a sordid avarice that for a hundred pounds would have sold her own person or her husband's character to anybody that would bid for it. 1737

The Pelhams and Horace Walpole tried all they could to bring Sir Robert into this reducing scheme, but to no purpose. Harry Pelham had voted for the bringing in the Bill, and was absent the great day of the debate when it was to be thrown out. Harry Pelham the Queen never loved; and this conduct of the Duke of Newcastle on the three per cent. scheme, in opposition to her inclinations, coming so quick upon his disapproved behaviour in the Scotch business, put him at present so ill with Her Majesty, that she abused him in private as freely as most other people had long done in public; and of course his interest at Court, to put its decay in the strongest light, was now little superior to his reputation out of Court. Lord Hervey at first was as zealous as anybody for this scheme taking effect, but when he found how determined the Queen and Sir Robert were to obstruct and defeat it he took a very short turn and told them both, whatever his opinion had been in the gross question, since they had reasons that induced them to think it would be prejudicial to the interest of the Court and the Administration to have it succeed, as he wished to do them service, and concluded they knew best what was most for their service, he should talk on the subject and influence the people he had any interest in just as they would have him; his Lordship determining not to do as the Bishop of Salisbury had done in several points mentioned in these papers, which was to share an odium at Court incurred by those whose interest he wished weakened, and at the same time tread in the very steps by which he hoped they would weaken it.

1737 Horace Walpole, though his brother made him vote against the three per cent., did it with so ill a grace and talked against his own conduct so strongly and so frequently to the Queen that Her Majesty had him at present in little more esteem or favour than the Duke of Newcastle. She told him, because he had some practice in treaties and was employed in foreign affairs, that he began to think he understood everything better than anybody else; and that it was really quite new his setting himself up to understand the revenue, money-matters, and the House of Commons better than his brother. "What are you," said the Queen, "without your brother? Or what are you all but a rope of sand that would crumble away in little grains one after another, if it was not for him?" And whenever Horace had been with her speaking on these subjects, besides telling Lord Hervey, whenever he came to her, how like an *opiniâtre* fool Horace had talked upon them, she used to complain of his silly laugh hurting her ears, and his dirty sweaty body offending her nose, as if she had never had the two senses of hearing and smelling in all her acquaintance with poor Horace till he had talked for three per cent. Sometimes she used to cough and reach as if she was ready to vomit with talking of his dirt; and would often bid Lord Hervey open the window to purify the room of the stink Horace had left behind him, and call the pages to burn sweets to get it out of the hangings. She told Lord Hervey, too, she believed Horace had a hand in the *Craftsman*, for that once, warmed in disputing on this three per cent. affair, he had more than hinted to her that he guessed her reason for being so zealous against this scheme was her having money herself in the stocks.

Nor was the Duke of Newcastle on this occasion much better treated by Her Majesty than Horace. She said his Grace was such a mixture of fiddle-faddle and popularity that there was no making anything of him; for that he had sometimes so many scruples whether he should do the King's business or not, and at other times was so

desirous to undertake more than he could do, that 1737
between his objections to some things and his incapacity
in others he never did any.

The Scotch affairs, and his declaring himself unneces-
sarily (for it did not come into the House of Lords) so
much against the opposition Sir Robert Walpole made to
the three per cent. scheme, together with the stories which
Lord Ilay and Lord Hervey were perpetually telling Sir
Robert of the assiduous court he paid to Lord Carteret
and the Bishop of Salisbury, made Sir Robert Walpole
more uneasy with his Grace at present than he had ever
been before; and an incident happened at this time that
would certainly have completed his Grace's ruin at Court
had it not been for that politic disposition in Sir Robert
Walpole (falsely called forbearance) which always in-
clined him to go on with cracked leagues and alliances,
and try to make them hold by patching and cementing,
rather than risk the shock of breaking them quite and the
hazard of forming new ones. The incident I mean was this.
One night that the Duke of Newcastle came half-drunk
from a Westminster School feast, where he and Lord
Carteret (being both Westminster scholars) had dined
together, he went directly to Sir Robert Walpole's, and
made a tender in form of Lord Carteret's service, offering
at the same time to be surety for his good behaviour;
which Sir Robert Walpole took with a high hand, and
told his Grace (Mr. Pelham and Horace Walpole only
being present): "I am glad, my Lord, you have given me
this opportunity once for all to let you know my deter-
mined sentiments on this matter, and without further
expostulation on what you would have me do which I will
not do, or what I would hinder you doing and cannot,
that your Grace must take your choice between me and
him; and if you are angry at my saying this, I care not. I
have said it to your betters, and I'll stick to it." When Sir
Robert Walpole told this to Lord Hervey he said at the
same time that the Duke of Newcastle's interest was at so

1737 low an ebb at Court, that to expel the House of Pelham from St. James's, if he went about it, would not cost him twenty-four hours' work. But he added, too, that he was too old to form new schemes and new plans of government, and therefore must rub on with this as long as it would go, and when it would last no longer he must throw up his cards. He said all this, too, to Lord Ilay, who told it to Lord Hervey, not knowing Lord Hervey had had it from Sir Robert himself.

When the Scotch Bill went down to the House of Commons, all the Scotch members being against it on a national consideration, and all the Tories, from their general principle of opposing bills of pains and penalties, it was impossible for the Court to pass the Bill in the form it was sent down; and as the Court was earnestly solicitous that the Parliament, after this long inquiry, should not let so atrocious a crime and so impudent an insult to the Government pass without any mark of censure, or even a show of punishment, so Sir Robert Walpole was forced to labour very hard to prevent the Bill from being entirely flung out. After many days spent in long debates on several points in the Bill, many more passed in hearing counsel and evidence for and against the personal and town parts of it, many divisions, and most of them very near ones, and several very warm contests, a Bill (for it would be very improper to call it *the* Bill, considering the changes made therein) passed the House of Commons, consisting only of these two articles: the one to disable Mr. Alexander Wilson, late Provost of Edinburgh, from ever holding for the future any office of profit or trust in Great Britain, or Ireland, or any of His Majesty's dominions, and the other to fine the town of Edinburgh two thousand pounds, and give it to the widow of Captain Porteous. This last article was originally intended to be in the Bill, but, being a money-matter, was left to be added in the House of Commons, that no offence might be given to endanger the Bill on account of those pecuniary privileges of which

the Commons were so jealous and on all occasions so 1737
immovably tenacious.

The Duke of Newcastle and my Lord Chancellor were very angry to see the child which the one had begot, and both of them had nursed with so much care and tenderness in the House of Lords, so mutilated and defaced in the House of Commons; and the generality of mankind, who looked on these great transactions in cool blood, were not a little jocose on the two Houses of Parliament having been employed five months in declaring a man should never again be a magistrate who had never desired to be one, and in raising two thousand pounds on the city of Edinburgh to give the cook-maid widow of Captain Porteous, and make her, with most unconjugal joy, bless the hour in which her husband was hanged.

Mr. Pulteney's conduct in all these Scotch affairs was as little to be approved as in the three per cent. business, and less to be accounted for; since the reason why he who proposed one day to govern this country should have taken this opportunity to ingratiate himself with the Scotch is very evident; and why he should have acted the absent neutral part he did, in never attending any one of the debates on this subject, I believe nobody would be able to assign any satisfactory cause. Forty-five members in one House, and sixteen in another, make too considerable a body of men to be neglected, especially considering how unitedly they generally move; and the opportunities of joining them in opposition to a court are so few that Mr. Pulteney's slipping this was, in my opinion, as great a solecism in politics as any man could be guilty of.

The Prince made the same blunder; for had His Royal Highness, instead of lying quiet, and not interesting himself one way or other in this question, united his little band and fought under the Scotch banner in this contest, it is not impossible but that some of the Scotch Members, as rarely as gratitude influences Scotch conduct, might, when his £100,000 came to be again under parliamentary

1737 consideration, not only have remembered, but endeavoured to repay, this obligation.

When the Bill, with all these alterations, came back to the House of Lords, the Duke of Argyll opposed its passing, even thus blunted, as strongly as he had done before its edge was so effectually taken off; and took this opportunity to evacuate his long silent and treasured spleen against the Duke of Newcastle in so barefaced and provoking a manner, that most people condemned the one for offering this affront, and everybody the other for not resenting it. He began with turning the Bill, as it now stood, into ridicule; and then, directing his eyes and his words to the Duke of Newcastle, said it would be a very dangerous precedent to punish everybody in office for not acting as if they had sense. Of the two it would be more reasonable to punish those who put them there; but he was not for punishing either, for everybody knew that there might be very good reasons for giving people employments in the State besides their having sense; they might have great titles, great estates, great property, great zeal to serve whoever was in power. "Nay, some, I won't say all," continued his Grace, "may, with very little sense, have great integrity and good characters; and such men it may be very proper for a Government to employ in offices where sense is not much wanted; and for the men of rank, titles, and estates, they, too, may often be put very properly into places that require some talents, though their own may be very unfit for such places; because we all know there are people of very mean parts who will condescend to bear the name of offices whilst others do the business, and let the Government have all the advantage of their estates without exposing the Government to the disadvantages of being modelled by their understandings. But if such men were to see that they were to be responsible, like this poor provost, for not acting with all the circumspection of able men, when everybody knows they might as well pretend to infallibility as ability, I think it would

prevent many people from entering into the service of the Government whom it is very right from their property to attach to the interest of the Government. And I think besides it would be as great an injustice for the House of Lords to punish a man for being a fool as for having the gout. They are both infirmities, not faults. They are the misfortunes, not the transgressions, of those who are infected with them, and make them much more proper objects of compassion than of resentment." 1737

His Grace of Argyll enlarged much on these topics, and stared the Duke of Newcastle in the face every time he said anything he designed should be applied to him, and particularly the name of fool, the Duke of Newcastle all the while appearing under the utmost uneasiness, not knowing what to do, what to say, which way to look, and, doubling the rapidity of all those graceful motions and attitudes which, even when he was not out of countenance, used to take their turn in his figure, whilst he picked his nose, his ears, and every other nasty thing that belonged to him. When the Duke of Argyll had finished, the Duke of Newcastle, thinking himself obliged to say something, got up and articulated so incoherently and so unintelligibly for half an hour together that this strange harangue seemed a caricature even of his own usual strange performances, and looked (as Shakespeare makes Cæsar say of Cassius's smiles) as if he mocked himself. Most people blamed the Duke of Argyll for so squab an attack; and those who had a mind to blame him most called it quite unprovoked. Provocation that day, nor any day in public, the Duke of Argyll had certainly received none; but he told Lord Hervey that to his certain knowledge the Duke of Newcastle had often, in repeating what had been said in debates, misreported things that had fallen from him, not only to the King and Queen, but to Sir Robert Walpole, which he had known again by his brother Lord Ilay; "and, my Lord," continued he, "it was my brother, as little as he thinks him his friend, and as little as he

1737 deserves he should be so, who prevented me once this winter from breaking this stick which you see in my hand over his Grace's head."

The Scotch Bill, however, passed just in the shape it came up new-modelled from the House of Commons; and thus ended this long examination into the murder of Porteous, which had made so great a noise in the two Houses of Parliament and the two kingdoms, of whose blood thousands were guilty, though not one drop was shed to atone for it. I think I cannot, therefore, conclude this narrative better than with the words of Lucan—"Quicquid multis peccatur, inultum est."

At the end of the session a Bill was passed to settle a jointure of £50,000 a year on the Princess; and another Bill, which was hurried almost as fast through both Houses, to put all players whatever under the direction of the Lord Chamberlain, and to prevent even his having a power to license any company of actors in any part of the kingdom but in the city of Westminster, or where the King should reside. The present great licentiousness of the stage did certainly call for some restraint and regulation; and besides the general liberty that was taken at this time with religion as well as Government in the theatrical representations, Sir Robert Walpole had got into his hands two plays in manuscript, which were the most barefaced and scurrilous abuse on the persons and characters of the King and Queen and the whole Court, and made these insults on Their Majesties a plea for having recourse to Parliament to put a stop to their being acted, saying he had tried all other methods, and found every other would be ineffectual to prevent these pieces coming on the stage. In the House of Commons little opposition was made to this Bill by anybody of note but Mr. Pulteney, nor in the House of Lords but by Lord Chesterfield, who made one of the most lively and ingenious speeches against it I ever heard in Parliament, full of wit, of the genteelest satire, and in the most polished, classical style that the Petronius

of any time ever wrote. It was extremely studied, seemingly 1737
easy, well delivered, and universally admired. On such
occasions nobody spoke better than Lord Chesterfield;
but as he never could, or at least never did, speak but pre-
pared, and from dissertations he had written down in his
closet and got by heart, he never made any figure in a
reply, nor was his manner of speaking like debating, but
declaiming.

Lord Carteret, through his emissaries to the Queen's
ear, pleaded great merit at Court from his having said
nothing against this Bill, which he knew was a favourite
point at St. James's, and desired those who had the care
of his cause on this occasion not to forget to put Her
Majesty in mind of the same tacit compliment he had
paid the Court this year in the question on the army. The
mentioning of this last circumstance puts me in mind of a
thing Lord Aylesford, an old Tory Lord in the Opposition,
said to Lord Carteret on that occasion in my hearing after
the division was over: "By God! Carteret, I know not
what you mean by this; but whatever you mean, I believe
after this you will not find it very easy to get any party or
any set of men to trust you again. I am sure I will not; and
where you will find fools that will, I don't know." Lord
Carteret only smiled, and said he was ready to fight if
anybody would have begun the battle; but he would not
always be thrust forward like the forlorn-hope on every
attack. To this my Lord Aylesford replied: "Why, did not
Bathurst begin and make a motion for 12,000 men only?
No, that excuse won't do. By God! Carteret, we all know
you"; and then walked off; after which Lord Carteret
turned to us who were sitting by him, and said, with a
cheerful unconcern, not at all affected or put on, but quite
natural: "Poor Aylesford is really angry."

At the end of this session the King in his speech thanked *June 21*
both Houses of Parliament for their conduct in his son's
affair, without naming it directly, but in a manner nobody
could mistake, any more than the hint he gave them, at

1737 the end of his Speech, of his hoping such an extraordinary question would never be moved again. But notwithstanding this hint, nobody had the least doubt of its being one of the first questions that would be moved in the next session.

Sir George Oxenden, a Lord of the Treasury, having voted for the Prince on this question, was turned out just before the Parliament rose, and Mr. Earle put in his place. This Earle was originally a dependent on the Duke of Argyll, a man of no great abilities, of a sordid avaricious temper, a very bad character, and as profligate in his discourse as his conduct, professing himself always ready, without examining what it was, to do anything a minister bid him; by which means he had worked himself so well into Sir Robert's good graces, that, merely by his own personal interest there (which even his attachment at the same time to the Duke of Argyll could not outweigh), he got himself preferred to this high post, the whole world exclaiming against such a prostitution of the office. Lord Hervey solicited it for the eldest Mr. Fox, but Sir Robert Walpole, having a mind to take Earle, instead of the immediate gift of this employment gave Lord Hervey an absolute promise of a peerage for Mr. Fox (though undated) whenever he should make any new peers. A peerage being what Lord Hervey had always most desired for Mr. Fox, he entered readily into this composition; but said as he had asked nothing for himself, and had only the two Mr. Foxes and his own brother under his protection, he should think it very hard if nothing this year was done for any of them; and intimated, though he should always serve Sir Robert to the best of his power himself, that he could not answer for their doing so; and owned he could not be so little a friend to them as to advise or desire men of their age to make themselves reversionally desperate with the Prince without any acquisition or reward in present. Lord Hervey pushed this expostulation in several conferences with Sir Robert so far that Sir Robert took it

ill of him; but did that from being displeased with Lord 1737
Hervey which, to show how little the favours and friendships of ministers sometimes correspond, I believe he would not have done had he been better satisfied with him; for Sir Robert gave the youngest Mr. Fox the employment of Surveyor of the King's Works, which was an office not only very creditable, but worth above eleven hundred pounds a year. To the eldest brother he confirmed the peerage promise he had made before through Lord Hervey; and to Mr. Hervey he gave a sum of money in present, and a promise to provide for him the first vacancy. When Lord Hervey, who was now in Suffolk (where he had been sent for on his father's being ill) wrote to the Bishop of Norwich to complain in his name to Sir Robert Walpole that nothing more was done for his brother, Sir Robert told the Bishop he could not help it; that there was but this one employment he had to give; that if Lord Hervey had been in town he would have given him his choice between Mr. Fox and his brother; but the time pressing for making out the writ for a new election had made him choose as he thought Lord Hervey would approve, as Mr. Hervey would take money in the meantime till another employment fell, and the other would not.

Sir George Oxenden nobody was sorry for, for he was a very vicious, ungrateful, good-for-nothing fellow. There was a great similitude between the character of this man and that of Clodius. "*P. Clodius homo nobilis, disertus, audax, qui neque dicendi, neque executor acerrimus, infamis etiam sororis stupro et actus incesti reus ob initium inter religiosissima sacra adulterium.*"—Velleius Paterculus. He passed his whole life, like Clodius, in all manner of debauchery and with low company; he had, like Clodius too, committed incest with his sister; that is he had had two children by his wife's sister, who was married to his most intimate friend Mr. Thompson, from whom, upon Sir George Oxenden's account, she was separated, and died in childbed not without Sir George's being suspected

1737 of having a greater share in her catastrophe than merely having got the child. Besides this, as Clodius had debauched the wife of his friend Cæsar, Sir George Oxenden had done the same favour to the wife of the eldest son of his friend, benefactor, and patron, Sir Robert Walpole, for Sir Robert had always been partial to Sir George Oxenden, taken him from his first entrance into the world under his protection, and by his favour early and undeservedly raised him into this office in the Treasury. This intrigue with Lady Walpole, and her having but one son, which the world gave to Sir George Oxenden, is alluded to in these two lines in a copy of verses written by Lady Mary Wortley, wherein she supposes Sir Robert Walpole speaking of Sir George Oxenden:

“Triumph enough for that enchanting face,
That my damnation must enrich his race.”

But supposing it were so, I do not imagine, since this boy would, as well as any other, transmit the name of Walpole to posterity, with the title Sir Robert had got for his son, that Sir Robert cared very much who had begot him; and I have the more reason for being of this opinion, as Sir Robert Walpole more than once, in speaking of this child to me, has, with all the sang-froid imaginable, called him that boy, got by nobody knows who, as if he had been speaking of a foundling. But had Sir Robert Walpole been more solicitous about the father of this boy, he would not have been without comfort; for though the public, from the little propensity it has to err, had always rather give a child to any father than the man whose name it bears, and did pretty currently impute this to Sir George Oxenden, yet from the extreme aversion my Lady Walpole showed to this poor little animal from the very hour of its birth all judicious, candid, and unprejudiced commentators sagaciously and naturally concluded that she, at least, who must be the ablest judge, entertained no doubt of its being her husband's. Sir George Oxenden was a pretty figure

and, notwithstanding his profligate conduct and character, 1737 was modest in his public behaviour; but, though not wanting parts, was much inferior in this article to his likeness, Clodius.

Lord Westmorland was likewise at this time turned out of being captain of the fourth troop of Horse-Guards for having voted for the Prince. The Duke of Montagu was put in his place; and his Grace having formerly sold his troop to Lord Pembroke, and Lord Westmorland having originally bought into the army, this change gave the old Duchess of Marlborough occasion to say, not amiss, that the Court had taken away a troop of Horse-Guards from Lord Westmorland, who never had anything in the army but what he had bought, to give it to the Duke of Montagu, who never had had anything but what he had sold. Lord Archibald Hamilton was the only one who had not voted for the King in the Prince's question who was not turned out. He had only been absent, but for this sin of omission had certainly been put out of the Admiralty had Sir Robert Walpole's good-nature or policy, I know not which, or both together, not saved him, for the King was set upon doing it and the Queen not averse.

As soon as the Parliament was up, the Court removed to Richmond; and though it was rumoured among people in the town, and suspected by some in the palace, that the King would go to Hanover this year, yet it was by those only who knew nothing of the present *carte du pays*, for Madame Walmoden seemed to those who knew the King best to be quite forgot. Nobody had named her these six months; not the King himself had this great while mentioned her to the Queen; and he seemed so thoroughly easy that those who observed His Majesty most narrowly imagined he thought as little as he spoke of her. The child she had had by him (as he thought at least) was dead, and the most incredulous now began to cease doubting of His Majesty's tasting all the pleasures with Lady Deloraine which she was capable of bestowing, not merely from her

1737 taking Lady Suffolk's place in the evening, in the country, next the King at the commerce-table among the maids of honour; but her walking tête-à-tête with him often at Richmond, and her own manner of talking, at this time, at last convinced everybody of what she had long taken infinite pains to prevent their being deceived in. She told Lady Sundon, with whom she was very little acquainted, that the King had been very importunate these two years and had often told her how unkind she was to refuse him; that it was mere crossness, for that he was sure her husband (Mr. Wyndham, who was Sub-Governor to the Duke) would not take it at all ill. Lady Sundon was so extremely surprised at this very communicative conversation of Lady Deloraine's, that she knew not what answer to make to her, and told me she muttered something, but could not really remember what. Lady Deloraine, speaking one day at Richmond to Lord Hervey of the King in a room full of company, said to him, in the midst of her conversation, in a very abrupt whisper: "Do you know the King has been in love with me these two years?" To which Lord Hervey, a little embarrassed for fear of shocking her vanity by seeming to doubt it, or drawing on further marks of her confidence by giving seriously in to this, only answered with a smile: "Who is not in love with you?" Sir Robert Walpole one day, whilst she was standing in the hall at Richmond with her little son of about a year old in her arms, said to her: "That's a very pretty boy, Lady Deloraine; who got it?" To which her Ladyship, before half-a-dozen people, without taking the question at all ill, replied: "Mr. Wyndham, upon honour"; and then added, laughing, "but I will not promise whose the next shall be." However, in private, when she spoke seriously to Sir Robert Walpole, she pretended not to have yet yielded and said she was not of an age to act like a vain or a loving fool, but if she did consent that she would be well paid; adding, too, that nothing but interest should bribe her, for as to love, she had enough

of that, as well as a younger man, at home, and that she 1737
thought old men and kings ought always to be made to
pay well; which, considering whom she spoke to, as well as
whom she spoke of, made this speech doubly well judged.
To many people, from whom it used to come round in a
whisper to half the inhabitants of the palace, she used to
brag of this royal conquest, and say she thought England
in general had great obligations to her, and particularly
the Administration; for that it was owing to her, and
her only, that the King had not gone abroad. Everybody
knew, she said, that Sir Robert Walpole and the Queen
had done all they could to hinder his journey to Hanover
the year before to no purpose; and they would have
attempted it again to no purpose this year had it not been
for the King's attachment to her. In short, her daily and
hourly conversation was all in the same strain; for which
reason, I think, it would be great tautology in me to add
to this account that her Ladyship was one of the vainest
as well as one of the simplest women that ever lived. But
to this wretched head there was certainly joined one of the
prettiest faces that ever was formed, which, though she
was now five-and-thirty, had a bloom upon it, too, that
not one woman in ten thousand has at fifteen, and what is
more extraordinary a bloom which she herself never had
till after she was twenty-five and married. She was of a
middle stature, rather lean than fat, neither well-made,
nor crooked, not genteel, and had something remarkably
awkward about her arms which were long and bony, with
a pair of ugly white hands at the end of them. Such was
the lady who at present engrossed the dalliance of the
King's looser hours, His Majesty having chosen not from
any violence of passion, but as a decent, convenient,
natural, and unexceptionable commerce, to make the
governess of his two youngest daughters his whore, his
two eldest daughters convenient,¹ and the guardian
director of his son's youth and morals his cuckold.

¹*Sic.* See p. 491.

1737 The Queen affected not to be at all uneasy at this engagement, but she only affected it, for though she was glad to find His Majesty's attachment to Madame Walmoden weakened, she could not help repining at his being only gone another way abroad, and not come home, though nobody paid any court to Lady Deloraine, nor had this new mistress the appearance of any power. All people at a distance, and some who were nearer, imagined the Queen had put Lady Deloraine in His Majesty's way, on purpose to engage him at home, and to find him some employment, out of her own apartment, to keep him in England and from Madame Walmoden. Perhaps she might do so and, as it happens to many people, afterwards mourned the success of her own schemes; but I am inclined to think, what was yet more unreasonable for her to propose as it was so improbable to expect, that she hoped her coquet husband should talk, and laugh, and play at quadrille, with this pretty fool, and never go further.

The two eldest Princesses, in whose apartment in town the King played every night with Lady Deloraine, were very innocently accessory to this amour, and, as they were very different in the turn both of their tempers and understandings, behaved very differently on reflecting upon the situation they were in and the part they had acted. The Princess Emily, who cared for nobody nor anything, laughed, and the Princess Caroline, who cared both for her mother's ease and her own character, sighed. To the Princess Caroline Lady Deloraine's behaviour was still more extraordinary and absurd than it had been to anybody else. Lady Deloraine had formerly been a great favourite of the Princess Royal's and was one of the legacies the Princess Royal had left to the Princess Caroline when she went to Holland, desiring her sister always to be kind to her for her sake. The Princess Caroline, always faithful and steady in her friendships, had, for the sake of this charge and this recommendation received

from her sister, been most particularly kind and essentially serviceable to Lady Deloraine, having by her interest with the Queen prevailed on Her Majesty to suffer Lady Deloraine to remain at Court after she had married Mr. Wyndham, though the Queen had always told her Ladyship, if she could not live a widow she should not live with her daughters. In short, the Princess Caroline having always shown so much favour to Lady Deloraine, that fool concluded she might as properly make her the *confidente* of her amour with the King as her marriage-affair with Mr. Wyndham, and used often, after setting forth the violence of the King's passion, and the urgency of his attacks, to ask the Princess Caroline's advice what she should do. To which the Princess Caroline, bursting almost with a smothered anger (for her fear of the King made her not dare to give a loose to it), used with the best appearance she could put on of sang-froid to say: "Ah, my dear fly" (which was a nickname Lady Deloraine went by at Court), "you must really know your own affairs better than me. You are a great deal older, as well as wiser, and therefore must know the world much better. Besides, my dear fly, you have had two husbands, and I never had one, so you must know how to act the part of a wife better than I can tell you." Lady Deloraine once desired the Princess Caroline to tell Mr. Wyndham the embarrassment she was in, pretending she was ashamed to do it herself, and in short put the Princess Caroline into so many difficulties, between the fear of her father, the love of her mother, and regard to herself, that she wanted all the good sense, temper, and dexterity she was mistress of to extricate herself out of the perpetual disagreeable situations in which this idiot put her.

The King as usual talked to the Queen of his lying with Lady Deloraine, and the Queen to Lord Hervey and Sir Robert Walpole talked of it with little ceremony. Sir Robert Walpole said to Lord Hervey he was not sorry the King had got a new plaything but wished His Majesty

1737 had taken somebody that was less mischievous than that lying bitch. Lord Hervey said: "I wonder, Sir, you give yourself any uneasiness about that. What matter how mischievous she is, or what lies she tells? If she got the ear of anybody that had power it might be of very bad consequence, but since 'tis only the King, I think it is of no great signification." Sir Robert Walpole laughed extremely, and seemed almost as well pleased with this little stroke of satire upon His Majesty as he was with the flattery to himself that followed it, when Lord Hervey added that what Miss Skerrit said of people was of importance to every man in England, but that for Lady Deloraine she might say her worst or do her best, he thought neither the one nor the other was anybody's business but her own and the King's. His Lordship liked this bon-mot so well, that he employed the former part of it, relating to the King's power, in a conversation on the same subject with the Queen; and varied the flattery by saying if Her Majesty had taken Lady Deloraine as Dr. Lamb's successor, to pare her nails, to be sure the good courtiers would have taken alarm at anybody so mischievous being in the way of doing so much harm, but as she only went to bed to the King, lying *with* him or *to* him was much the same as her lying *to* or *with* Mr. Wyndham.

Whilst the King and Queen were at Richmond, the Prince and Princess were at Kew; and having, soon after they came, declared Mrs. Townshend (to whom the King had twice refused his consent) Woman of the Bedchamber to the Princess, they sent her with Lady Effingham, the Lady in Waiting on the Princess, to Richmond to be presented to the King and Queen. The King was so angry at this, which he thought done, as to be sure it was, on purpose to shock him, that, hearing Mrs. Townshend was in the drawing-room, and on what errand, he sent Lord Harcourt, his Lord in Waiting, to let her know he would not allow her to be presented; upon which, without saying one word, Lady Effingham and she went out of the room

and returned to Kew to give an account of their expedition. But notwithstanding this new bustle the Prince and Princess, without taking the least notice of what had happened, put Mrs. Townshend into waiting, and continued themselves to come to the Lodge every Sunday and Thursday to make a visit for five minutes before dinner to the King and Queen, who both of them always spoke to the Princess, but neither of them one word to the Prince, though the Queen was only mute, whilst the King was absolutely blind too, not seeming even to know he was in the room. 1737

There had been various opinions for many months passed on the Princess's being with child; but whilst the Court was at Richmond, a few days before Sir Robert Walpole went his usual summer journey into Norfolk, the Prince wrote the following letter to the Queen, and sent it by my Lord North, his Lord of the Bedchamber then in waiting:

DE KEW, *ce 5 de Juillet.*

Madame,

Le Dr. Hollings et Mrs. Cannons¹ viennent de me dire qu'il n'y a plus à douter de la grossesse de la Princesse; d'abord que j'ai eu leur autorité, je n'ai pas voulu manquer d'en faire part à votre Majesté, et de la supplier d'en informer le Roi en même tems. Je suis, avec tout le respect possible,

Madame,

De votre Majesté

Le très-humble et très-obéissant fils et serviteur,

FREDERICK.

The next time the Princess came to Court after the Queen had received this letter, Her Majesty, after making Her Royal Highness rather the proper compliments than her sincere felicitations on this occasion, asked the Princess when she was to lie-in? To which Her Royal Highness answered: "I don't know." The Queen then asked "if she was quick," and was again answered:

¹A midwife.—*Lord Hervey.*

1737 "I don't know." "Is it, then, the beginning of your being with child?" said the Queen; but the variation in the question produced none in the answer, which was still "I don't know"; from which the Queen concluding the Princess had received from conjugal authority absolute commands to make no other reply than "I don't know," whatever should be asked, Her Majesty gave over her interrogatories, and began to talk of something else.

About this time Lord Scarborough was seized with an illness in his head, which everybody thought was madness and everybody, consequently, who said what they thought, called by that name; but as many people had a real regard for Lord Scarborough, and many more thought it a good air to affect it, they took advantage of an overturn in a coach which he had had some days before this disorder grew strong enough to confine him, and imputed all these symptoms, which had been upon him in a less degree for many months before, to this accident. The Queen, who never loved Lord Scarborough for the merits he had, and yet believed he had one which he had not (which was a personal attachment to the King), affected being extremely concerned for him, and sent, for a fortnight together, once or twice a day to London, to inquire after his health. Both she and the King were equally lavish on this occasion in their encomiums on Lord Scarborough's worth and value, but not equally sincere in them. When they used to talk in their private hours to Lord Hervey of the affection he had personally for the King, Lord Hervey (from a rule he had laid down, of never, unprovoked, doing anybody any ill offices, where ill offices were of so much consequence) always gave in to it; though, the very day before Lord Scarborough was confined, Lord Hervey had gone with him tête-à-tête from Richmond to London, and their whole discourse was how unamiable the King was, and how he contrived (notwithstanding he had some good qualities, which everybody must esteem) to make it absolutely impossible for anybody to love him. For

example, they both agreed that the King certainly had 1737
personal courage, that he was secret, and that he would
not lie—though I remember, when I once said the last of
these things to Sir Robert Walpole, he said, "Not often"
—but Lord Hervey and Lord Scarborough both agreed,
too, that notwithstanding these good qualities, which were,
like most good qualities, very rare, and consequently very
respectable, His Majesty's brusqueries to everybody by
turns, whoever came near him, his never bestowing any
thing from favour, and often even disobliging those on
whom he conferred benefits, made him so disagreeable to
all his servants, that people could not stand the ridicule
even of affecting to love him for fear of being thought his
dupes; and thus those whose interest it was to hide his
faults, and support his character in the world, were often
the very persons who hurt it most; as people at a distance
who railed at him might be thought to do it from
ignorance or pique, whilst all his own servants giving
him up in the manner it was the fashion to do, must be
concluded by all the world to proceed from their thinking
it impossible to conceal it, or from their hating him too
much to desire it.

What gave rise to this conversation was a thing (in the
style of many His Majesty uttered) which he had said that
very day, at his dressing, before at least half-a-dozen
people, upon Lord Hervey's telling His Majesty that he
believed he was very glad, after so long a session, to get a
little fresh air in the country; to which His Majesty very
naturally, but very impolitically, replied: "Yes, my Lord,
I am very glad to be got away, for I have seen of late, in
London, so many hungry faces every day, that I was afraid
they would have eat me at last." The number of things of
this kind he used to be perpetually saying would fill
volumes if I were to recount them all; for between those
he affected to advance by way of showing his military
bravery, and those which flowed naturally from his way of
thinking and absolute incapacity of feeling, nobody could

1737 be with him an hour without hearing something of this kind that would give them an ill opinion of him for their lives. I once heard him say he would much sooner forgive anybody that had murdered a man than anybody that cut down one of his oaks, because an oak was so much longer growing to a useful size than a man, and, consequently, one loss would be sooner supplied than the other. And one evening, after a horse had run away, and killed himself against an iron spike, poor Lady Suffolk saying it was very lucky the man who was upon him had received no hurt, His Majesty snapped her very short, and said: "Yes, I am very lucky, truly; pray where is the luck? I have lost a good horse, and I have got a booby of a groom still to keep." But that I may not tire myself with writing, and others with reading, more samples of His Majesty's tenderness to humankind in general, and to those who served him in particular, I shall return to the thread of my historical narrative.

Soon after the Court removed from Richmond to Hampton Court Sir Robert Walpole returned from Norfolk and told Lord Hervey he found, as usual, that in his absence strong attacks had been made upon his interest at Court. His reasons for saying so were that the King had recurred to finding fault with the message Sir Robert had made him send in the winter to the Prince; that the Queen had told him Lord Carteret's constant conversation at present was in praise of her; that she knew he was writing the history of his own times, and had told it to those who had related it again to her that he would make Her Majesty's name famous to all posterity; that she knew Pulteney and Wyndham, allowing Lord Carteret superior abilities and thinking he had a superior interest to them at Court, had entered into an agreement with him to act in concert with him and under his direction; but that Carteret, at the same time, had said he knew Pulteney very well, that he was a very useful second in Opposition, but a man who had such flights and starts that no minister

could ever depend upon him, and such impracticable fits 1737
of popularity that no Court could ever keep him long. To
this Sir Robert answered: "Madam, I understand all this
perfectly. People who wish Carteret well, and me ill, have
made this report to Your Majesty to set off the dexterity
of my Lord Carteret; but it is mere dexterity on one side,
I believe, and I hope it is so on the other; for he tries this
way of bragging of his power over Pulteney and Wyndham
to get an interest with Your Majesty, and boasts to
them of his interest in Your Majesty in order to get a
weight with them, which I am convinced he has not; but,
supposing it true, and that Pulteney did speak favourably
of Carteret and resolve to submit to him, and that Carteret
spoke with so little regard of Pulteney, what would these two
circumstances, taken for granted, amount to further than
this—that Pulteney says that of Carteret's interest with
you which Carteret has made him believe; and that
Carteret, to recommend himself to you, speaks of Pulteney
as he imagines you, who do not love Pulteney, think of
him yourself and like to hear him say of him?"

These reports Sir Robert suspected to be made to the
Queen by Sir Luke Schaub, Monsieur de Montandre,
and Lady Sundon; and when he told Lord Hervey that
he believed the last had the greatest share in them, added:
"I know you have a partiality for her, but she is a damned
inveterate bitch against me, and I know where and when
she has seen Carteret lately more than once or twice."
Lord Hervey owned he had a partiality for her. He said
she had, unasked by him, and unboasted of by her, done
him several times, the summer after he had quarrelled
with the Prince, many good offices with the Queen, which
he had heard of since by the Queen and the Princess
Caroline; and that he should think himself very ungrateful
not to feel obligations of that kind laid on him at a time
when few people took his part, and when he could not
speak for himself. Sir Robert said everybody had their
partialities, and few for so good reasons as Lord Hervey

1737 had given. "But your partialities, my Lord, should not blind you. I remember you would not believe she had spoke to the Queen against Madame Walmoden's coming over." "Nor do I believe it now," replied Lord Hervey. "Why, then, my Lord, the Queen told me herself she had." Lord Hervey said: "I have done, Sir; you have stopped my mouth." But I must here observe, by the bye, that Lord Hervey was sure Sir Robert must have lied on this occasion, because both the Queen and Lady Sundon had told him that she had never, to the Queen, named Madame Walmoden directly or indirectly on any occasion in her life.

However, in this affair relating to Lord Carteret, Lord Hervey (though he neither said he disbelieved Lady Sundon's part in it, nor owned the reason he had not to doubt it) easily gave credit to all Sir Robert Walpole said upon it, because Lady Sundon herself, as well as Sir Robert Walpole, had told Lord Hervey that she had met Lord Carteret twice on the Queen's gravel walk in St. James's Park that runs behind their two houses, and because, both from Lady Sundon and the Queen, Lord Hervey had heard that particular of Lord Carteret's writing the history of his own times—from Lady Sundon the very night Lord Carteret said it, and with the addition of "Madam, if you dare own at Court you talk to so obnoxious a man as I am, you may tell the Queen I have been giving her fame this morning."

This the Queen also told to Lord Hervey, so that he had it from all three without any one of the three knowing that he had had it from the other two. The Queen, at the same time she told Lord Hervey this circumstance, said she heard Carteret gave himself great airs of resolving, if ever he came into the Administration, to support her; and added: "An impertinent coxcomb! I think it is rather me that must support him": which looked as if those who had endeavoured to make his court by this report, had not done it in very judicious terms.

One morning when she was talking to Lord Hervey of 1737 this History, and Carteret's bragging he would make her famous to posterity and many future ages, when nobody was present but the King, His Majesty said: "Yes, I dare say he will paint you in fine colours, that dirty liar!" "Why not?" said the Queen. "Good things come out of dirt sometimes; I have ate very good asparagus raised out of dung." Lord Hervey said he knew three people that were now writing the History of His Majesty's Reign who could possibly know nothing of the secrets of the palace and His Majesty's closet, and yet would, he doubted not, pretend to make their whole history one continued dissection of both. "You mean," said the King, "Lords Bolingbroke, Chesterfield, and Carteret." "I do," replied Lord Hervey. "They will all three," said the King, "have about as much truth in them as the Mille et Une Nuits. Not but I shall like to read Bolingbroke's, who, of all those rascals and knaves that have been lying against me these ten years, has certainly the best parts and the most knowledge; he is a scoundrel, but he is a scoundrel of a higher class than Chesterfield. Chesterfield is a little tea-table scoundrel, that tells little womanish lies to make quarrels in families, and tries to make women lose their reputations, and make their husbands beat them, without any object but to give himself airs; as if anybody could believe a woman could like a dwarf-baboon." The Queen said all these three Histories would be three heaps of lies, but lies of very different kinds; she said Bolingbroke's would be great lies, Chesterfield's little lies, and Carteret's lies of both sorts. "But which," said the Queen to Lord Hervey, "for the style, should you like best to read?"

Lord Hervey said he should certainly choose Lord Bolingbroke; for, though Lord Bolingbroke has no idea of wit, yet his satire is keener than anybody's that has. Besides, his writings are always larded with a great deal of knowledge as well as seasoned with satire; his words are well chosen, his diction extremely raised, and his style

1737 so flowing that it does not seem at all studied or forced; and when he makes use of uncommon words, seems to do it from not being in a common way of thinking, rather than seeking them. Lord Chesterfield's Memoirs will have a great deal of wit in them, but you will see in every page he resolves to be witty; every paragraph will be an epigram. His style for short treatises is excellent, but in a long work all that labour and polishing, which he bestows on everything he writes, will appear stiff and tiresome. Connection will be wanting; and that want of transition which is so pardonable when it proceeds from haste, or a little negligence in running quick from one subject to another, will have an abrupt air and a disagreeable broken effect in such a constrained studied style, that it has not in writings of a looser and more natural sort. For Lord Carteret's work, I am not so capable of conjecturing what it will be, as I have seen very few things of his writing; but what I have, always seemed to me inaccurate, with a strong touch of bombast mixed with vulgarisms; and like some ungenteel people's dress, whom one sees at once over-fine and yet fine but by halves, in a coat embossed instead of embroidered, and a dirty coarse shirt.

I am now come to a very extraordinary occurrence, in which I shall be very particular. It had been long talked of that the Prince intended the Princess should lie-in in London; and the King and Queen having resolved she should not, measures were concerting to prevent her doing so. It was at last resolved—that is, the King and Queen and Sir Robert Walpole had agreed—that the King should send a message to the Prince to tell His Royal Highness that he would have the Princess lie-in at Hampton Court. Lord Hervey told the Queen and Princess Caroline that, notwithstanding this message, he would answer for it the Princess would not lie-in where the King and Queen resided. The Queen asked him how he could imagine, as insolent as the Prince was, that he would venture to disobey the King's positive commands on this

point. Lord Hervey said the Prince would pretend it was 1737
by chance; for as Dr. Hollings and Mrs. Cannons would
be made to say that exercise was good for the Princess in
her condition, she would be carried once or twice a week
to Kew or London, and, whichever of these two places the
Prince intended she should lie-in at, he would make her,
when she was within a month of her time, affect to be
taken ill; and as nobody could disprove her having the
pains she would complain of, the King and Queen could
not take it in prudence upon them to say she should be
removed; and there, of course, Her Royal Highness would
bring forth. "Well, if it is to be so," replied the Queen,
"I cannot help it; but at her labour I positively will be,
let her lie-in where she will; for she cannot be brought to
bed as quick as one can blow one's nose, and I will be
sure it is her child. For my part, I do not see she is big;
you all say you see it, and therefore I suppose it is so, and
that I am blind."

The Queen was every day pressing Sir Robert to have
this message sent to the Prince, saying: "Sir Robert, we
shall be caught; he will remove her before he receives any
orders for her lying-in here, and will afterwards say that
he talked so publicly of his intentions, he concluded if the
King had not approved of them he should have heard
something of it." Sir Robert said, as the Princess did not
reckon till the beginning of October, that it was full time
enough; and in this manner, from day to day, this in-
tended message was postponed, till it never went; for on
Sunday, the 31st of July, the Princess was taken in the
evening, after having dined in public that day with
the King and Queen, so very ill, with all the symptoms
of actual labour, that the Prince ordered a coach to be got
ready that moment to carry her to London. Her pains
came on so fast and so strong, that her water broke before
they could get her out of the house. However, in this con-
dition, M. Dunoyer, the dancing-master, lugging her
down stairs and along the passages by one arm, and Mr.

1737 Bloodworth, one of the Prince's equerries, by the other, and the Prince in the rear, they, with much ado, got her into the coach; Lady Archibald Hamilton and Mr. Townshend remonstrating strongly against this imprudent step, and the Princess begging, for God's sake, the Prince would let her stay in quiet where she was, for that her pains were so great she could not set one foot before the other, and was upon the rack when they moved her. But the Prince, with an obstinacy equal to his folly, and a folly equal to his barbarity, insisted on her going, crying "Courage! courage! ah, quelle sottise!" and telling her, with the encouragement of a toothdrawer, or the consolatory tenderness of an executioner, that it would be over in a minute. With these excitations, and in this manner, after enjoining all his servants not to say one word what was the matter, for fear the news of the Princess's circumstances should get to the other side of the house and their going should be prevented, he got her into the coach. There were in the coach, besides him and her, Lady Archibald Hamilton, and Mrs. Clavering and Mrs. Paine, two of the Princess's dressers; Vreid, his *valet de chambre*, who was a surgeon and man-midwife, was upon the coach-box; Mr. Bloodworth, and two or three more, behind the coach; and thus loaded he ordered the coachman to drive full gallop to London. About ten this cargo arrived in town. Notwithstanding all the handkerchiefs that had been thrust one after another up Her Royal Highness's petticoats in the coach, her clothes were in such a condition with the filthy inundations which attend these circumstances that when the coach stopped at St. James's the Prince ordered all the lights to be put out that people might not have the nasty ocular evidence which would otherwise have been exhibited to them of his folly and her distress. When they came to St. James's, there was no one thing prepared for her reception. The midwife came in a few minutes; napkins, warming-pan, and all other necessary implements for this operation, were sought by

different emissaries in different houses in the neighbourhood; and no sheets being to be come at, Her Royal Highness was put to bed between two table-cloths. At a quarter before eleven she was delivered of a little rat of a girl, about the bigness of a good large toothpick case, none of the Lords of the Council being present but my Lord President Wilmington, and my Lord Godolphin, Privy Seal. To the first of these the Prince, at leaving Hampton Court, had despatched a messenger to bring him from his villa at Chiswick; and the last, living just by St. James's, was sent for as soon as the Prince arrived in town. He sent also to the Lord Chancellor and the Archbishop; but the one was gone into the country, and the other came a quarter of an hour after the child was born.

In the meantime, this evening, at Hampton Court, the King played at commerce below stairs, the Queen above at quadrille, the Princess Emily at her commerce-table, and the Princess Caroline and Lord Hervey at cribbage, just as usual, and separated all at ten of the clock; and, what is incredible to relate, went to bed all at eleven, without hearing one single syllable of the Princess's being ill, or even of her not being in the house. At half an hour after one, which was above two hours after the Princess had been brought to bed, a courier arrived with the first news of her being in labour. When Mrs. Titchburne, the Woman of the Bedchamber, came to wake the King and Queen, the Queen as soon as she came into the room asked what was the matter that occasioned their being waked up at so unusual an hour; and, as the most natural question, inquired if the house was on fire. When Mrs. Titchburne said the Prince had sent to let Their Majesties know the Princess was in labour the Queen immediately cried: "My God, my nightgown! I'll go to her this moment." "Your nightgown, Madam," replied Mrs. Titchburne, "and your coaches too; the Princess is at St. James's." "Are you mad," interrupted the Queen,

1737 "or are you asleep, my good Titchburne? You dream." When Mrs. Titchburne insisted on its being certainly true, the King flew into a violent passion, and, in German (as the Queen told me afterward), began to scold her, saying: "You see, now, with all your wisdom, how they have out-witted you. This is all your fault. There is a false child will be put upon you, and how will you answer it to all your children? This has been fine care and fine management for your son William; he is mightily obliged to you; and for Ann, I hope she will come over and scold you herself; I am sure you deserve anything she can say to you." The Queen said little, but got up, dressed as fast as she could, ordered her coaches, and sent to the Duke of Grafton and Lord Hervey to go with her; and by half an hour after two Her Majesty set out from Hampton Court with the two eldest Princesses, two of their ladies, the Duke of Grafton, Lord Hervey, and Lord Essex (the King's Lord of the Bedchamber in waiting), who went to be despatched back again by the Queen, as soon as she got there, to acquaint the King how matters went. By four o'clock they all got to St. James's. When they arrived they asked how the Princess did, and, being told very well, concluded either that everything had not been ready for a trick, or that the Princess's pains were gone off, and that they had taken this journey for nothing. Lord Hervey told the Queen, as she was going upstairs, that he would order a fire and chocolate for her in his own apartment, concluding she would not stay long with her son. "To be sure," replied the Queen, "I shall not stay long; I shall be mightily obliged to you"; then winked, and said in a lower voice, "nor you need not fear my tasting anything in this side of the house."

When they came upstairs the Prince, in his night-gown and nightcap, met the Queen in the Princess's ante-chamber, kissed her hand and her cheek according to the filial fashions of Germany, and there told her the news of the Princess's being brought to bed of a daughter, as well

as who was present when she was delivered, and at what hour. The Queen expressed some little surprise that no messenger should have reached Hampton Court with the news of the Princess's being brought to bed before Her Majesty came from thence, when there had been three hours between the one and the other; upon which the Prince assured Her Majesty the messenger had been despatched as soon as ever he could get his letters to her and the King ready, and, as he had written but three lines, they had been finished in three minutes. The Queen knew this must be a lie, but did not *éclaircir* upon it, having determined (as she said afterward at Lord Hervey's lodgings) not to dispute or contradict anything His Royal Highness should advance, let it be ever so extravagantly absurd, or ever so glaringly false. I must observe, too, that these were the first words Her Majesty and His Royal Highness had exchanged since the day his affair had been moved in Parliament. The Queen went into the Princess's bedchamber, wished her joy, said she was glad she had escaped so well; and added: "Apparemmment, Madame, vous avez horriblement souffert." "Point du tout," replied the Princess, "ce n'est rien." Then Lady Archibald Hamilton brought in the child, which had yet no clothes but a red mantle and some napkins, nor any nurse. The Queen kissed the child, and said: "Le bon Dieu vous bénisse, pauvre petite créature! Vous voilà arrivée dans un désagréable monde."

The Prince then began to tell the whole story of the labour and the journey; and not only owned that on the Monday and Friday before he had carried the Princess to London, upon thinking, from some slight pains she then complained of, that her labour was coming on, but also wisely acquainted the Queen that the water was broke before the Princess left Hampton Court, that her pains in the coach were so strong he thought he should have been obliged to carry her into some house upon the road to be brought to bed, and that, with holding her and her pillows

1737 in the coach, he had got such pains in his own back he could hardly stir. He added many more particulars, on which the Queen made no comments, never asking why he did anything he had done, or left undone anything he had not done; and only said, at the end of His Royal Highness's every way absurd narrative, it was a miracle that the Princess and the child had not been both killed. Her Majesty then added: "At the indiscretion of young fools, who knew nothing of the dangers to which this poor child and its mother were exposed, I am less surprised; but for you, my Lady Archibald, who have had ten children, that with your experience, and at your age, you should suffer these people to act such a madness, I am astonished; and wonder how you could, for your own sake as well as theirs, venture to be concerned in such an expedition." To this Lady Archibald made no other answer than turning to the Prince, and saying aloud to him: "You see, Sir"; which was so prudent and so judicious an answer, as it intimated everything that could be urged in her justification, without directly giving him up, that I cannot help thinking chance put it into her mouth. The Prince, immediately upon this, began to talk to the Queen in German; which she afterwards said was nothing more than to repeat again all the nasty particulars of what had passed in the coach more in detail. The Duke of Grafton, Lord Essex, and Lord Hervey, were called into the Princess's bedchamber to see the child; and the door, both before and after, being open, they could hear everything that passed there. The Queen stayed not long in the Princess's apartment, saying rest was the best thing for the Princess in her present circumstances; and, just before Her Majesty went away, she went up to the bedside, embraced the Princess, and said to her: "My good Princess, is there anything you want, anything you wish, or anything you would have me do? Here I am; you have but to speak and ask; and whatever is in my power that you would have me do, I promise you I will do it." The

Princess thanked Her Majesty, said she had nothing to trouble Her Majesty with, thanked her for the honour she had done her, and hoped neither she nor the Princesses would be the worse for the trouble they had been so kind to give themselves. All this passed in German, but the Queen and the Princess Caroline told it me just in the words I have related it. 1737

The Prince waited on the Queen downstairs, and said he hoped Her Majesty and the King would do him the honour to christen his daughter; and the Queen promised him to take care of that affair. He then said he intended to come to Hampton Court that day, to ask this honour of the King and her in form. To which the Queen replied: "I fancy you had better not come to-day; to be sure the King is not well pleased with all this bustle you have made; and should you attempt coming to-day, nobody can answer what your reception may be." The Prince then named Thursday, and the Queen said Tuesday or Wednesday she thought would be better. The Prince being in his undress, the Queen insisted on his not coming out of his house, advised him to go to bed, and walked, herself, across the courts to Lord Hervey's lodgings. As soon as she got thither she wrote a short letter to the King, and despatched Lord Essex with it back to Hampton Court. She then said to the Duke of Grafton and Lord Hervey (nobody being present but the two Princesses): "Well, upon my honour, I no more doubt this poor little bit of a thing is the Princess's child, than I doubt of either of these two being mine, though, I own to you, I had my doubts upon the road that there would be some juggle; and if, instead of this poor, little, ugly she-mouse, there had been a brave, large, fat, jolly boy, I should not have been cured of my suspicions; nay, I believe they would have been so much increased, or, rather, that I should have been so confirmed in that opinion, that I should have gone about his house like a madwoman, played the devil, and insisted on knowing what chairman's brat he had bought."

1737 Lord Hervey said he really did believe, too, from what he had seen, that it was the Princess's child; though not in the least because it was a girl; for, as a girl would do just as well for the Prince's purpose as a boy, and that it would give less suspicion, so anybody who had advised him wisely would have advised him to take a spurious girl rather than a spurious boy. "But, altogether," said the Queen, "was there ever such a monstrous conduct? such a fool, and such an insolent, impertinent fool? and such an impudence, to receive us all with such an ease, as if nothing had happened, and that we were the best friends in the world?" The whole company were very free in their comments on His Royal Highness's behaviour throughout this whole affair; all abused him very freely, and said, very truly, that they believed, take all its absurdities together, nothing like it ever had happened before, or ever would happen again; since His Royal Highness had at once contrived to be guilty of the greatest piece of inhumanity, as a husband and a father, with regard to his wife and his child, the greatest impertinence and insolence, as a son and a subject, to his father and his mother, his King and his Queen, and the most egregious folly, as a Prince of Wales and heir to the Crown, by doing all he could contrive to make the birth of that child suspected, which he proposed should give him such additional weight in the kingdom, and make him of so much more importance than he had hitherto found himself. They all agreed that he had done much more towards making the world believe this was a spurious child than Queen Mary had done at the Pretender's birth; and, consequently, wisely contrived, if ever this Crown came to be fought for, to have the dispute be whether the people would have the Whig bastard or the Tory bastard.

After the Queen had passed about an hour at Lord Hervey's lodgings in drinking chocolate and expatiating on these particulars which I have related, Sir Robert Walpole arrived, who had been sent for from Richmond Park;

but a little before he came, I must not forget to relate that, 1737
the Duke of Grafton and the Princess Emily being gone into the next room to drink some tea with the Princess's two Ladies of the Bedchamber, the Queen said to Lord Hervey (the Princess Caroline only being present): "Be sure you do not ever say you foretold this would happen. I foresaw it too, and told it to Sir Robert Walpole, who was certainly in the wrong to delay sending the message to order the Princess to lie in at Hampton Court, since, if that message had gone, they would have been still more in the wrong, and we had had still more reason to resent what they have done; and no longer ago than when he went away from Hampton Court last Friday, I said: 'Pray, Sir Robert, think of this message; indeed we shall be caught; you do not know my filthy beast of a son so well as I do.' And he only answered: 'Pray stay a little; indeed, Madam, 'tis time enough.' And now you see—but, in short, it is over—and Sir Robert Walpole will take it ill if you ever talk of this omission; so be sure you never name it." As soon as Sir Robert came into the room, the Queen laughed, and only said, "Here we are, you see; am I in the right? what do you say now?" Sir Robert smiled too, but looked vexed and out of countenance, and said: "When anything very improbable happens, Madam, I do not think it is a great disgrace for anybody not to have foreseen it would happen." He then told the Queen that Lord Harrington, having lain this night at Petersham, was sent for at the same time that he had been, and that they came to town together. The Queen asked him what they had said to all this as they came along: to which Sir Robert answered, that Harrington, as usual, had lent his ear. "But, to speak in the sportsman's style," said he, "Madam, he has not given tongue often." He then told Her Majesty that the Prince (informed as he supposed by some of his servants that Lord Harrington and he were there) had ordered them to be called up; that the Prince was in bed, and had desired them to sit down by his

1737 bedside, which they had declined, not caring to enter at present into conversation with him; but that notwithstanding this endeavour to shorten the interview, the Prince had told them all the same particulars (except that of the breaking of the water) which he had before told the Queen—that is, of all that passed in the coach, who had been present at the labour, of the Princess having been ill Monday and Friday, and his having brought her to London both these days, thinking her complaints were the symptoms of approaching labour. “Take it altogether,” said the Queen, “do you think there ever was so insolent as well as silly a behaviour? Really they must be made to feel a little, for one is quite weary of being so very prudent and so very tame.” “It is true,” replied Sir Robert; “it is really, Madam, too much; it is intolerable. Here was the Princess, in the first place, within a month of her time before her being with child was notified to Your Majesty (for the letter my Lord North brought I think is dated the 5th of July); and then on the 29th, without any notification either of her departure or of her being in labour, she is hurried away from under the roof where Your Majesty and the King reside, and brought to bed in an hour after at St. James’s; whilst the first news you have of her being gone, or her being in labour, comes two hours at least after the time you ought to have had the news of her being brought to bed.” “My God!” interrupted the Queen, “there is really no human patience can bear such treatment; nor indeed ought one to bear it; for they will pull one by the nose in a little time, if some stop is not put to their impertinence. Besides, one is really ashamed for the figure one makes in foreign Courts, when such a story is told of the affronts one receives in one’s own family. What must other Princes imagine of one? I swear I blush when I think of the post going out, and carrying the account of such a transaction into other countries.” “It is all very true, Madam,” said Sir Robert Walpole; “but then consider a little whether you would

just take this opportunity of quarrelling openly with the Prince, and turning him out of your house, when an heir to the Crown is born. People already talk enough of the partiality the King and Your Majesty have for the Duke; and should all your anger break out at this time, they will be apt to say that your anger is principally occasioned by the Prince's having a child to disinherit your favourite." "My God!" interrupted again the Queen, "if one is always to bear affronts because something false may be said of one for resenting them, there are none one must ever resent." "Nay," replied Sir Robert, "I give no opinion yet, Madam; I only speak my present thoughts just as they occur, and quite unweighed." Lord Hervey said there was nothing contradictory in what Sir Robert Walpole had said to what the Queen proposed; since paying all the honours to the child that were possible to be shown to it, at the same time that a resentment was shown to the Prince's conduct, would take off Sir Robert Walpole's objection and would demonstrate that the King and Queen did not confound the innocent with the guilty, nor punish the sins of the father upon the child, but felt as they ought to do towards both. Sir Robert again repeated that he as yet gave no opinion, and that it was a matter that required being very maturely considered. "However," said the Queen, "I am glad we came; for though one does not care a farthing for them, the giving oneself all this trouble is *une bonne grimace pour le publique*; and the more impertinences they do, and the more civilities we show, the more we shall be thought in the right, and they in the wrong, when we bring it to an open quarrel." "That is so true," said Lord Hervey, "that upon the whole I think their behaviour is the luckiest affront any Court ever received, since everybody must condemn their behaviour in this particular, which will consequently put them, who were on the attack in the quarrel, now upon the defensive; and if they do bring their money question next year into Parliament, his asking for an augmentation

1737 of a father he has not only offended but affronted will not be thought quite so reasonable a request as when he could pretend to have never failed in his duty."

The Queen then sent for Lord Harrington, saying he would take it ill if she did not see him; and when he came, in the midst of all this anger and bustle, she began to joke with him upon his gallantry, and said she believed it was the first time he had ever been sent for at midnight to a young lady in the Princess's circumstances. She stayed not long in Lord Hervey's lodgings after Lord Harrington came, and by eight o'clock got back again to Hampton Court. Sir Robert Walpole, before he followed the Queen, was to go to Lord Godolphin to ask an account from him of what had passed whilst he was present at the Princess's delivery. Just as they were all separating, Lord Hervey sent Mr. Harry Fox to desire Sir Robert Walpole, the first thing he did when he came to Hampton Court be to send for him, that he might speak to him before he saw the King. Mr. Harry Fox Lord Hervey had sent for the moment he came to town, thinking there would be some juggle (as the Queen apprehended) about a false child, and that he should want some sensible, clever body he could trust to employ in making discoveries.

Lord Godolphin told Sir Robert Walpole that Lord Wilmington and he had been in the Princess's bed-chamber a quarter of an hour at least before the child was born; that they were on the same side of the bed with the midwife, and very near her, and the Prince close to the bed on the other side; that the Princess, in her manner of complaining, marking one pain she had much stronger than any of the former, the Prince said: "Is the child born?" to which the midwife replied: "Don't you hear it cry?" and then immediately brought it from between the sheets and gave it into my Lord President's hands. The Prince then asked if it was a boy or a girl; and the midwife said the Princess, in her present circumstances, must

not be surprised with either the joy or the mortification of 1737 knowing which it was.

As soon as Sir Robert Walpole had learnt these particulars from Lord Godolphin, he set out for Hampton Court, and, as soon as he arrived there, sent for Lord Hervey. In this conference Lord Hervey reminded Sir Robert how often he had told him that within these few months, on many occasions, both the King and the Queen had seemed to relax a little in the degree of favour they had formerly shown him; that it had always been on their son's chapter they had done so, and from his appearing either too unwilling to gratify their resentment against him, or too forward in proposing palliatives to an evil to which they were so strongly inclined to apply more violent medicines. "And though," continued Lord Hervey, "you can divert them from pursuing the measures they are inclined to, you cannot cure them of their desire to pursue them, nor make them relish those which you have interest enough to persuade them to follow in their stead." "My Lord," replied Sir Robert, "I have seen and felt the truth of what you say; and the King is never out of humour with me on these occasions that he does not recur to the message sent to the Prince last winter, and tell me 'tis I who have made his son independent; 'tis I have put it in the Prince's power to dare to use him as he does, and put it out of his power to punish him for it. I then tell him: 'Sir, the giving the £50,000 at that time and in that manner saved your £100,000.' But, my Lord, I know the meaning of all this; it is the single thing I ever did against the Queen's will and without her consent, and that is the reason this sin against the Holy Ghost is not forgiven. She begged, that morning the message was sent, I would defer the measure at least till next day. I said: 'Madam, to-morrow it will be too late: there is no time to deliberate; we must act.' She then said: 'It is such a mean condescension in the King to follow this advice that I can never consent to it.' I then told her: 'Madam, 'tis all you

1737 have for it'; and went out of her room directly to the King's closet; where, after reasoning, and hearing him bluster and swagger, I was forced to say, when he had done nothing but oppose me: 'Sir, I ask your pardon; I must not give you time to retract your consent; the Lords of the Council are in the next room, and I will give them your orders this minute, for time presses—you have none to lose.' And in this manner, my Lord, supposing him to have given consent when he had given me nothing but contradiction, I got the thing done."

I must here remark that Sir Robert Walpole, as often as he had talked of this transaction of the message to Lord Hervey, had never related it in this manner before. He had always spoke of the Queen's consent as extorted, but not denied; and I believe he only put it in this light now that he might make people think it was her pride, not her judgment, that made her still condemn a measure he could not retract and would not give up.

Lord Hervey said: "Sir, you will certainly ruin your interest here if you go on in combating the King and Queen's inclinations in this quarrel. Those who have a mind to hurt you will take such advantage of their passions and what they will call your phlegm, that they will either say your conduct proceeds from management of the Prince, or that old Ministers dare venture on no vigorous measures, that new ones can do anything they please at setting out, and that, if the King and Queen will give them power, they will lay their son in tears and penitence at Their Majesties' feet." "What then," interrupted Sir Robert Walpole, "would you have me say? Would you have me advise a separation, and the turning the Prince out of St. James's?" "No," replied Lord Hervey; "if you give it as your judgment and your advice, you charge yourself with the consequences, and lose the merit of the compliance. I would therefore in your place tell them that though in public matters and parliamentary affairs it is your business to advise, yet in their family affairs it is

your duty to obey; and that, as you are always ready to 1737
give counsel in the one, you are equally ready to receive
orders in the other. In any point where abilities,
penetration, or judgment are requisite, I am sure, Sir, I
am unable to offer anything that can be of use to you; but
as the present point, with regard to you, turns chiefly on
the temper of the King and Queen, I see so much of them,
and hear so much of their sentiments in this question (for
you know they talk or think of nothing else), that it is
impossible, unless I was deaf and blind, but that I must
be able to guess a little how they stand affected, more
perhaps even than they suffer to appear to you, and more
even perhaps than they would have appear to me."

"You are so much in the right," said Sir Robert
Walpole, "that I know, even after the question last year
was carried against the Prince, upon my desiring them
to be satisfied with victory, and not to push victory to
oppression, upon my advising the execution of the articles
of the message, and saying that execution was unavoidable,
I know the King and Queen deliberated whether they should
not at once change the Ministry, disavow me in that step,
and make the supporting them in a non-performance
of those articles the first condition with my successors.
But here, my Lord, lies the disagreeable difficulty of my
situation: when I tell them if they will arm me with
power I will conquer and humble their son, I receive such
a flow of grace and good words, such a flood of promises
and favour, that I could dictate nothing stronger; yet,
whenever I propose anything particular, I am answered
short by the King: 'I will not do that.' How many people
there are I could bind to me by getting things done in the
army you may imagine, and that I can never get any one
thing done in it you perhaps will not believe; but it is as
true as that there is an army, that I never ask for the
smallest commission by which a Member of Parliament
may be immediately or collaterally obliged, that the
King's answer is not 'I won't do that; you want always to

1737 have me disoblige all my old soldiers; you understand nothing of troops; I will order my army as I think fit; for your scoundrels of the House of Commons you may do as you please; you know I never interfere, nor pretend to know anything of them, but this province I will keep to myself.' Now, if I, my Lord, should advise, or, without advising, only obey orders in separating the Courts, there is all the Prince's family, be they more or less, thrown in every question into the Opposition; and how is the loss of those votes to be replaced?" Lord Hervey replied: "Sir, I do not pretend to counsel or to judge; I only state the facts I know, and represent some circumstances which may escape you, and leave you afterward, as the fittest and ablest judge I know, to weigh those particulars with others, and make your own determination. I can see your difficulties, but I am sure I am incapable of helping you in the least to extricate yourself out of them." "In short, my Lord," interrupted Sir Robert, "the King, on one hand, is so peremptory in what he will have done, and so costive in furnishing the means to do it, expects so much and furnishes so little, and the Queen, on the other, is so suspicious of one's sincerity, and gives one so much reason to doubt of hers, fancies often she sees so much more than there is to see, and gives me often occasion to see so much more than I dare own I see, that I am quite weary of my situation, and have been much nearer than you think of throwing it all up and going to end my days at Houghton in quiet." Lord Hervey said: "To be sure, Sir, there are things in your situation you would be glad to alter, but what Minister has not such things? And sure, since it is impossible not to meet with some difficulties, you ought to reflect with pleasure and satisfaction that your good fortune has exposed you to as few as any Minister ever had, and your good sense enabled you to get better through them. Besides, Sir, you have so many people dependent upon you that your good-nature to them will hinder you from leaving them to shift for them-

selves." "I know," replied Sir Robert, "that chance and 1737
concurring circumstances have put me in such a situation
that (as much vanity as there may seem in saying it) I am
certainly at present in a situation that makes me of con-
sequence to more people than any man before me ever was,
or perhaps than any man may ever be again; but yet, my
Lord, to anybody at my age, who has been plagued with
the thorns and glutted with the fruits of power as long
as I have been, ease and safety are considerations that will,
one time or other, outweigh all others."

Neither was this the first or second time Sir Robert
Walpole had, to Lord Hervey, launched out into such a
dissertation on his own importance, which Lord Hervey
could not, to be sure, in decency, but give into, whatever
he might inwardly think of the double vanity this great
man was guilty of in believing what he said, and saying
what he believed. Cæsar's vanity swallowed as much when
Cicero told him it was true he had lived enough for fame
and for himself, but not for his country, but Sir Robert
Walpole, I believe, was the first man who ever said so
much of himself; which makes the one yet more extra-
ordinary than the other, as Tully only hoped to be believed
in what he said without believing it himself, whilst Sir
Robert Walpole did both. Whereas, with regard to
states and nations, nobody's understanding is so much
superior to the rest of mankind as to be missed in a week
after they are gone; and with regard to particulars, there
is not a great banker that breaks who does not distress
more people than the disgrace or retirement of the greatest
Minister that ever presided in a cabinet; nor is there a
deceased ploughman, who leaves a wife and a dozen brats
behind him, that is not lamented with greater sincerity,
as well as a loss to more individuals, than any statesman
that ever wore a head or deserved to lose it.

Rochevoucauld says: "What makes other people's
vanity insupportable is, that it wounds our own": but this
stroke of Sir Robert Walpole's had a quite different effect

1737 on Lord Hervey, as it was a weakness that made him feel the difference between them less.

But if at this time Sir Robert Walpole's vanity deceived him in imagining he was, to England, what the spring is to a watch, and that all the wheels moving round him would stand still if he was taken away, in another point Lord Hervey, I believe, flattered himself to the full as grossly; for, as much as he valued himself on being constitutionally unrevengeful—for he did not pretend it was from the Christian principle of turning the other cheek, but merely from a natural incapacity of hating long—as much, I say, as he valued himself upon this temper, I doubt much whether, in the present transactions, he was not as little free from resentment in what he did, as Sir Robert from vanity in what he said. For the pains he took to bring Sir Robert into every scheme to mortify the Prince, and the zeal with which he laboured every project to distress His Royal Highness, would not, I believe, if one could have dived into the deepest source of every action, have been found to proceed merely from his desire to prevent Sir Robert Walpole's losing his interest with the King and Queen, any more than I imagine all the severe and bitter things he said to the King and Queen at this time of their son flowed solely from a desire to make his court to their passions, and not a little to indulge the dictates of his own.

The truth is, if his temper was susceptible of provocation, he might, without being capable of feeling long provoked at the same circumstance, have continued long warm in his resentment against the Prince, since scarce a day passed without some new lie the Prince had made of him during the quarrel, as well as some virulent thing he now said of him, being reported to Lord Hervey by the Queen or the Princess Caroline, who both hated the Prince at this time to a degree which cannot be credited or conceived by people who did not hear the names they called him, the character they gave him, the curses they

lavished upon him, and the fervour with which they both 1737
prayed every day for his death.

It would be endless to endeavour to repeat all the lies Lord Hervey at this time heard the Prince had coined of him, but one or two of the most remarkable I will insert. The Prince told the Queen and all his sisters that Lord Hervey had told him everybody said His Royal Highness was known to have such a partiality for the Princess Royal, and to be so incapable of concealing anything from her, that nobody doubted his having an intrigue with her. Another was that Lord Hervey, from the moment he first came about him, had been always endeavouring to give him ill impressions of the Queen and all his sisters; to blow him up against his father; and a hundred times endeavoured to persuade him to make a party to move for his £100,000 a year in Parliament, as well as brought offers to him from people in the Opposition, and made use of Miss Vane's interest to get them accepted.

I do not relate these things as any justification of Lord Hervey's conduct at this time; for if personal resentment, and a desire to vex and mortify the Prince, had any share in his views and counsels at this juncture, I own he is not justifiable, as nothing can justify the meanness of a man of sense desiring, from a principle of revenge, to hurt those by whom he has been injured, further than self-preservation requires, or the silly received laws of mistaken customary honour enjoin. But take this particular (with regard to the Prince) out of Lord Hervey's character, and I believe it would be impossible to give another instance of the same sort of wrong to anybody in any part of his conduct; though few people had more enemies, or had reason to be irritated against more people, if being abused is allowed to be a reason.

It will be very natural for people to wonder for what purpose, or to what end, the Prince was guilty of this most egregious piece of folly (which nobody did, and nobody

1737 could, justify) in hurrying his wife in these circumstances to London, to the manifest peril both of her life and that of the child; and the reason of such an extraordinary step I take to have been this. The Prince's counsellors, who at this time did all they could to blow up his pride and put him upon everything they thought would mortify the King's, had talked him up into asserting his own independency on this occasion, and told him the most effectual way to do it, and to show he was his own master, and accountable to nobody for the direction of his own family, would be to make the Princess lie-in in London, without communicating his design to the King and Queen, consulting their opinion, or asking their consent. This advice, I conclude, was so grateful to the Prince, that, at all hazards, he was determined to follow it; and, notwithstanding circumstances which could his advisers have foreseen they would indisputably have desired him not to follow their own counsel, he judiciously put it in practice.

The Queen, at her return to Hampton Court, found the two following letters, that had arrived from the Prince to her and the King just after she had set out, to acquaint Their Majesties with the Princess's delivery:

ST. JAMES'S, *de Juillet* 31, 1737.

MADAME,

La Princesse s'étant trouvée fort mal à Hampton Court cette après dînné, et n'ayant personne là pour l'assister, je l'ai amené directement en ville pour sauver le temps que j'aurois perdu en faisant chercher Mrs. Cannons. Elle a été délivrée une heur après, fort heureusement, d'une fille, et tous deux se portent, Dieu merci, aussi bien qu'on peut attendre a cette heur. La Princesse m'a chargé de la mettre avec son enfant aux pieds de votre Majesté, et de la supplier de nous honorer tous trois de ses bontées maternelles, etant, avec beaucoup de soumission,

Madame,

Votre très humble et très obéissant fils et serviteur,

FREDERICK.

SIRE,

1737

C'est avec tout le respect possible que je prends la liberté de mander a votre Majesté que la Princesse est, Dieu merci, aussi bien qu'on peut etre, depuis qu'elle a été délivrée d'une fille, qui se porte bien aussi. Elle me charge de la mettre avec son enfant aux pieds de votre Majesté, et de la suplier de nous honorer tous les trois de ses bontéz paternelles, étant, avec toute la soumission possible,

Sire,

De votre Majesté,

Le très humble, très obéissant fils,
et serviteur, et sujet,

DE ST. JAMES'S, le 31 de Juillet, 1737.

FREDERICK.

These letters are bad French, and ill spelt; but it is not owing to the copyist, but the author.

What passed this morning between the King and Queen at Her Majesty's return from London, between her and Sir Robert, or between Sir Robert and the King, it is unnecessary for me to particularize, since these conferences were made up only of repetitions of what I have already related, interlarded with the appellations of scoundrel and puppy, knave and fool, liar and coward, which were seasonings thrown with no sparing hand into every conversation at this time in which the Prince's name was ever used, when His Majesty made one of the company.

The result of these consultations, in short, was that Lord Harrington and Sir Robert Walpole should state in writing what the Prince had said to them, as corroborative evidence of what he had said to the Queen before his sisters; and that, when the Prince came to Hampton Court, the King should send Lord Essex, his Lord of the Bedchamber in waiting, with a message in writing to tell His Royal Highness the King would not see him; and this being settled, the Lords of the Cabinet Council, according to custom, were to be called to give their sanction to this measure, that they might, as usual, have their share in being responsible for what in form and

1737 appearance only they ever had any share in advising or concerting. The message Lord Essex was to deliver was as follows:

The King has commanded me to acquaint Your Royal Highness:

That His Majesty most heartily rejoices at the safe delivery of the Princess, but that your carrying away Her Royal Highness from Hampton Court, the then residence of the King, the Queen, and the royal family, under the pains and certain indication of immediate labour, to the imminent danger and hazard both of the Princess and her child, and after sufficient warnings for a week before to have made the necessary preparations for that happy event, without acquainting His Majesty or the Queen with the circumstances the Princess was in, or giving them the least notice of your departure, is looked upon by the King to be such a deliberate indignity offered to himself and to the Queen that he has commanded me to acquaint Your Royal Highness that he resents it to the highest degree, and will not see you.

Minutes of Lord Harrington's and Sir Robert Walpole's Conversation with the Prince by his bedside, Aug. 1st, about five in the morning and taken down in writing about three hours after.

AUGUST 1, 1737.

The Prince of Wales this morning, about five o'clock, when Lord Harrington and Sir Robert Walpole waited upon him at St. James's, among other things said he did not know whether the Princess was come before her time or not; that she had felt great pains the Monday before, which it being apprehended might prove her labour, of which opinion Lady Archibald Hamilton and Mrs. Payne declared themselves to be, but the physicians were then of another opinion, he brought her from Hampton Court again.

That on the Friday following, the Princess's pains returning, the Prince carried her again to St. James's, when the physicians, Dr. Hollings and Dr. Broxholme, and Mrs. Cannons, were of opinion it might prove her labour, but those pains likewise going off they returned again to Hampton Court on Saturday; that he should not have been at Hampton Court on Sunday, but, it being public day, he feared it might be liable to some constructions; that the Princess growing ill again on Sunday, he brought her away immediately, that she might be where proper help and assistance could be had.

The Prince, on the Monday evening after the Queen, 1737 upon hearing the Princess was in labour, had been in town, wrote Her Majesty the following letter (which he sent by Lord Jersey), to thank her for this visit.

From the Prince at St. James's to the Queen at Hampton Court.

MADAME,

AUG. 1, 1737.

Comme vos commandemens m'ont empêché de venir aujourd'hui à Hampton Court, je prends la liberté de vous remercier très humblement, par ces lignes, de la bonté que votre Majesté a eu de venir voir cette nuit la Princesse. Elle continue de se porter, Dieu merci, parfaitement bien, et l'enfant de même. Nous nous recommandons tous trois aux bontés du Roi et de votre Majesté; et je suis, avec tout le respect possible,

Madame,

Votre très humble et très obéissant fils et serviteur,
FREDERICK.

The Queen saw Lord Jersey, and, having said she was glad to hear the Princess and the child were well, dismissed him.

In the meantime the Prince at St. James's summoned all his present advisers to Council—Lord Carteret, Lord Chesterfield from Thistleworth [Isleworth], and Mr. Pulteney from Tunbridge; who none of them flattered him so far as not to tell him he had made a false step, which would give the great and common enemy at Hampton Court an advantage over him which they ought not to have had. However, they promised him their aid and advice to retrieve his affairs, but none of them had prudence enough to advise (or interest enough to succeed if they did advise it) that he should immediately write to own he had been guilty of great faults, but that it was owing to the confusion he was in, and that he hoped the King and Queen would forgive what nothing but that confusion could have made him guilty of, and what he would not pretend to justify. His Royal Highness denied absolutely what he had said to the Queen about the water

1737 being broke before the Princess left Hampton Court, and said it broke in the coach. He denied too that the Princess at Richmond had answered "I don't know" to all the questions the Queen had asked her relating to the time she was gone with child, and said that the Princess had answered only that the physicians had not yet pretended to make an exact calculation. He told everybody about him too that he had had address enough to satisfy the Queen perfectly with regard to his conduct, and that she had undertaken to satisfy the King. All this he said to Sir Luke Schaub, who told it to the Queen, from whom I had it.

As the Prince did not attempt coming to Hampton Court on Tuesday, and that the King and Queen heard he designed coming on Thursday, which was a public day, the King, to avoid making a bustle before so many people (among which would be all the Foreign Ministers, and a deputation from the City with congratulations on the birth of the new Princess), sent Lord Essex on Wednesday morning with the foregoing written message, striking out only the words at the latter end, where His Majesty says he would not see him.

Lord Essex, when he returned, said the Prince was in such confusion that he could not take upon him to repeat what His Royal Highness answered to the message, further than that he muttered several expressions of surprise at the King's anger, sorrow for having offended him, and general words of that kind.

In the evening the Prince sent Lord Jersey, his Lord in Waiting, to Hampton Court with two letters—one to the King, and the other to the Queen—which were as follows:

*The Prince to the King, Aug. 3, 1737, by Lord Jersey,
from St. James's.*

SIRE,

C'est avec toute la mortification possible que je vois, par le message que my Lord Essex m'a porté, que ma venue en ville avec

la Princesse a eu le malheur de déplaire à votre Majesté. Permettez-
moi, Sire, de vous représenter, que dans le cas pressant où je me trou-
vais dimanche, sans sage-femme ni aucune assistance, il m'étoit
impossible de m'arrêter un moment: sans cela je n'aurois jamais
manqué de venir moi-même en faire part à votre Majesté, outre que
la plus grande expédition du monde n'auroit jamais pu amener Mrs.
Cannons que deux ou trois heures après la naissance de l'enfant.
Comme la Princesse avoit eu la colique pendant quelques jours,
Mrs. Cannons et les Docteurs Hollings et Broxome furent consultés
plusieurs fois, qui m'assurèrent tous qu'elle n'étoit pas si proche
encore de son terme, ce que les deux médecins étoient d'opinion
encore le dimanche à midi; mais qu'en cas qu'elle eût des peines
différentes de la colique, on lui dût donner un cordial et l'amener en
ville aussitôt qu'on pourroit. J'ai suivi ceci en tout point, et suis très
affligé qu'il est arrivé un cas où ma tendresse pour la Princesse pou-
voit paroître d'écarter un moment la première pensée que j'ai sans
cela, toujours de montrer mon dévouement envers votre Majesté.
D'ailleurs, si j'ose dire, la Princesse m'a le plus instamment désiré
dans ce moment de l'amener à Londres, où toute assistance lui étoit
plus proche, que je n'y ai pas pu résister, car je n'aurois jamais pu
me pardonner si, en conséquence de mon refus, aucun malheur lui
fût arrivé. J'espère que tout ceci touchera votre Majesté, et qu'elle me
permettra de me mettre à ses pieds demain à son lever, ce que je n'aurois
pas manqué de faire lundi passé si la Reine ne m'avoit ordonné de ne
le faire que comme aujourd'hui. La seule chose qui m'en a empêché
est la peur que j'ai eu depuis que j'ai vu my Lord Essex de déplaire à
votre Majesté en me présentant devant elle avant d'avoir pris la
liberté de lui expliquer, avec toute soumission, l'unique et véritable
motif de la démarche dont elle m'a paru offensée. Je suis, avec tout
le respect imaginable,

Sire,

De votre Majesté

Le très humble et très obéissant fils,
serviteur, et sujet,

FREDERICK.

*From the Prince at St. James's to the Queen at Hampton
Court, by Lord Jersey, Aug. 3, 1737.*

MADAME,

Vous ne sauriez croire comme le message que my Lord
Essex m'a apporté m'a affligé. Je me flattois que les raisons que j'ai
pris la liberté de donner à votre Majesté quand elle a eu la bonté de

1737 venir voir la Princesse avoit justifié mon départ de Hampton Court auprès du Roi: je prends la liberté de les récapituler dans ma lettre que je me suis donné l'honneur de lui écrire sur ce sujet, me flattant que votre Majesté aura la bonté de les appuyer. Je suis, avec beaucoup de respect,

Madame,
Votre très humble et très obéissant fils et serviteur,
FREDERICK.

When these letters came to be considered in order to determine what answer should be sent, the first determination was to send no answer in writing. And as the Prince in this letter never once admitted he had committed a fault, but pretended to justify what he had done, by giving reasons for it, pleading the direction of the doctors and the desire of the Princess; and as he added to this obstinacy the abominable falsehood, which the King and Queen knew to be such, of this surprise only making him seem to forget his duty, when they knew he had before been determined to give them no notice of his going, whenever he went; and as this appeared, by his own confessing to the Queen, his sisters, Sir Robert Walpole, and Lord Harrington, that he had already, twice in the preceding week, carried the Princess in expectation of her labour without telling it before or after to the King or Queen; so the King determined to refuse giving him leave to come to Hampton Court, and sent no other answer by Lord Jersey to the Prince than, *tout court*, that he would not see him. The Queen's answer to His Royal Highness requesting her good offices with the King was verbal too, and nothing more than that she was sorry the Prince had put it out of her power to make them effectual.

After this Lord Jersey was dismissed, much, I believe, to his personal satisfaction (though not as an ambassador), for he had waited long for the answer, had a foot as big as his head with the gout, and, the night being very cold, rainy, windy, dark, and blustering, it is easy to imagine

he was thoroughly impatient to be in a warm bed in 1737 London.

The King was rather irritated than appeased by these letters of the Prince's, as it was plain the Prince resolved not to own he had been in the wrong, but hoped to amuse the King with a verbiage of sorrow for His Majesty's anger, without confessing he had deserved it, and at the same time to load the Queen with indirect reproaches at least by insinuating that she had done nothing towards softening the King, and intimating that she had sunk things that might have done it. Sir Robert Walpole fortified them both in their resentment of such usage, and said nothing but a thorough confession of error on the part of the Prince, and acknowledging what everybody knew was the case, could entitle him to the King's pardon.

The next day the Prince sent another letter to the King, but none to the Queen, nor any message; nor was she mentioned in the King's letter. Lord Jersey was so ill after his expedition the preceding night, that he kept his bed; so this letter was brought by Lord Carnarvon, another Lord of the Prince's Bedchamber, and was as follows:

ST. JAMES'S, *Aug. 4, 1737.*

SIRE,

Me permettez-vous de mettre ma douleur devant vos pieds du refus que j'ai eu hier au soir de vous faire ma cour aujourd'hui. Je ne saurois exprimer combien je souffre d'être privé de cette honneur, et de me voir hors des bonnes grâces de votre Majesté. Si quelque chose pouvoit me consoler dans mon malheur, c'est l'innocence de mes intentions, lesquels je supplie votre Majesté de croire ne peuvent jamais être de vous offenser. Je ne prends pas la liberté de récapituler les raisons qui m'ont induit à quitter Hampton Court si subitement, mais je me flatte que votre Majesté m'accordera plus facilement le pardon que je lui demande quand elle réfléchira à l'état où je me trouvois alors avec la pauvre Princesse dans un temps qu'il ne m'étoit pas permis de m'arrêter un moment. J'ose donc conjurer instamment votre Majesté de me rétablir dans vos bonnes grâces, et de me permettre de vous faire ma cour demain à votre levée, jusqu'à

1737 quel temps je ne saurai être en repos. Je suis, avec tout le respect imaginable,

Sire,

De votre Majesté

Le très-humble et très-obéissant fils,
serviteur, et sujet,

FREDERICK.

The King was at dinner, in public, when Lord Carnarvon arrived with this letter; and, as soon as he rose from table, he sent for Lord Carnarvon into the Queen's gallery, and dismissed him whilst he read the letter. After he had read it His Majesty sent Lord Essex to Lord Carnarvon, to let him know that, as the purport of this letter was just the same as that of the night before, it required no other answer. Lord Carnarvon insisted on Lord Essex's giving him this answer in writing; upon which Lord Essex returned with a pen and ink to the King to tell His Majesty that Lord Carnarvon desired he might have the answer in writing. But before the King (who was reading some letters that were just arrived by the German post) could refuse or comply with this request, the Queen (in whose dressing-room the King now was) asked Lord Essex for what he was returned; and Lord Essex telling, and asking, at the same time, if he should call one of the Ministers, the Queen said: "For what? to give an answer to Fretz? Does the King want a Minister to tell him what answer he likes to give to his son? or to call a council for such a letter, like an *affaire d'état*?" (I relate this in the words the Queen related it just now to me.) And the King, whilst they were speaking, turning about and asking what was the matter, the Queen told him for what Lord Essex was returned, and, that the King might not mistake what he had a mind to do, added: "But I suppose, Sir, you will not write to your son, and I have already told Lord Essex that I believed he would trouble you upon this subject to very little purpose." Accordingly the King, being thoroughly, by this hint, apprised what he was to have a mind to,

told Lord Essex he should give no other answer than 1737
what he had given already, and in no other manner. When Lord Essex went back, Lord Carnarvon still insisted, very wrongheadedly, that he would have his directions in writing; and, after squabbling a good while, at last took a pencil out of his own pocket, and, writing down what Lord Essex had told him, showed it Lord Essex, and asked him if those were the words; and so they parted, Lord Carnarvon angry with Lord Essex that he had done no more, and the King and Queen angry with him that he had done so much. The Queen said Lord Essex should have only invited my Lord Carnarvon to dine with him when Lord Carnarvon asked him to write, and then gone to dinner, with or without him, just as Lord Carnarvon pleased.

Sir Robert Walpole, who was in the outward room while all this passed in the gallery and the Queen's bed-chamber, came up to Lady Sundon whilst she was talking to Lord Hervey, and said: "There is the letter received, and the answer given, without my seeing King or Queen; and yet, Lady Sundon, if the answer is disapproved, you'll hear me blamed for it." Lady Sundon answered: "That may well be your fate when such an insignificant creature as I am hear myself blamed for things they have done, which I had never known were done till the blame and the knowledge came together."

It grew now very plain that the whole war was to be made upon the Queen, and the turn everybody took at the Prince's Court was saying the Queen had blown up the King first into this violent resentment, and by her art now kept him inflexible. The Queen asked Lord Hervey if it was not surprising to see that all their rage seemed pointed at her; and he said, not at all; for if wise people had a mind to hurt effectually, they would certainly strike at one's head, and not at one's elbow or one's knuckles. The Queen said if his counsellors thought she had any interest, sure this was not the way to gain her.

1737 To which Lord Hervey replied, perhaps they thought to carry her by storm, and as nobody was to be gained but by love or fear, as they despair of infusing the one, they might hope to excite the other. The Queen said if that was their scheme, they would find themselves mistaken; for she would never offer terms to her enemies in order to give up her friends.

The Duke of Newcastle, my Lord Chancellor, the Duke of Grafton, and many others, were much against bringing things to an extremity by a total separation of the two Courts in form, and were always talking how much they wished some means of accommodation might be found out, but never pretended to suggest what those means could be. On the other hand, the passions of the King and Queen made Sir Robert Walpole afraid of offering or giving into any palliating schemes; and Lord Hervey was perpetually telling him that, unless the bringing the question of the £100,000 no more into Parliament could be made one of the terms of the reconciliation, he could see no advantage could accrue to Sir Robert or the King from an accommodation in the family-point; and since that battle was to be fought again, that he thought Sir Robert would fight it to a greater advantage in an open rupture, in the foundation of which everybody must own the Prince had been the aggressor, than in the same situation in which it had been fought before; that it would be losing all the advantage the Prince's imprudence had given; that he would never give another handle of this kind; and that, without doubt, there would be much more to be said against giving the Prince an augmentation when he was upon the terms of an open breach with his father, than when the question of the £100,000 was the only dispute between them. Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole, too, that whilst everybody might go to both Courts, everybody would; and that all the opportunities that liberty gave people of making their court often to the Prince, and taking occasion to say how sorry they were

that things could not be made up, would only make the 1737
resentment of the Prince still stronger against Sir Robert,
and those few who did not dare to act the same part: that
as to Sir Robert's having advised the King and Queen, in
the winter, against turning the Prince out of St. James's,
the case was widely different; and that it would seem no
inconsistency in his conduct to the King and Queen, if he
gave into contrary measures at present, since there was a
very essential difference, as well as plain distinction, be-
tween turning the Prince out of their house on account of a
question moved in Parliament which he might say, and had
said, was no fault of his, as he could not prevent it, and the
turning him out for a fault which everybody must acknow-
ledge was a fault, and a fault merely and solely his own.

Sir Robert Walpole said he had considered all these
things; that he did feel and see every day how much
heavier other people's managements with the Prince had
made His Royal Highness's resentment fall upon him;
and that, to his knowledge, the Prince had within these
few days asked one of the King's Ministers (which was
my Lord Chancellor) whether he had any hand in the
message the King had sent him, intimating at the same
time his great indignation against those who had. This
also the Queen told Lord Hervey, saying at the same time
this was such a degree of insolence, to pretend to question
and bully and frighten the King's Ministers, as was not
to be suffered, and added that it was high time His Royal
Highness should be well lashed.

Lord Hervey agreed with her, but said, too: "Madam,
I own you must conquer at any rate, but you must at last
too forgive: for your own sake and your own honour you
must conquer, and for the sake of your family, and the
security of the common interest, you must forgive. You
may do things when you have conquered that it would be
meanness to do before; what will be lenity in one case
would appear only timidity in the other; and what would
be yielding now will be only forbearance then."

1737 The only objection Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey he had to separating the Courts, and setting the Prince at defiance, was that, as all the virulence of the Prince's counsels was at present aimed at the Queen, and everything that was done esteemed her doing, this step would occasion such a heap of treasured vengeance against her, that he did not know what might one day or other be the consequence of it. Lord Hervey said that was a very remote consideration, as it must suppose both her and the Prince to outlive the King, and that for her doing so it was a very unlikely case to happen, and even the Prince was not likely soon to see that happy day; and that, if Sir Robert Walpole was to start this difficulty even to the Queen herself, she would be far from imputing what he said to a tenderness for her, but would rather think he was alarming her fears to bring her into measures which he proposed only from a tenderness to himself, and a view to being first Minister to the third generation.

Sir Robert replied: "It would make her look at me a little more earnestly whilst I was speaking, my Lord, but it would not go so far as you say. I own she has governed the King so long by deceiving him that it makes her suspect a little of the same play from everybody else, as well as exercise a little of it to everybody else herself; which makes her often both have and give suspicions that are very inconvenient to her, as it takes off the confidence she ought to have in others, and lessens that which they would otherwise have in her."

Lord Chesterfield at this time said: "Lord Carteret governed everything at the Prince's Court; he is our sole adviser, all our measures are of his dictating, and I have not the vanity or insincerity to claim any of the merit that belongs to such counsels; all the honour of them is his own."

On the other hand, Lord Carteret, to everybody whom he thought ready to do him good offices to the King and Queen, declared his disapprobation of this step the Prince

had taken; and at first succeeded so well that the Queen, 1737 to everybody she discoursed with on these subjects with any freedom, said, though Carteret was a great knave, yet she did not believe he was so silly a knave as to have advised the Prince in this measure, or to have had any hand in the letters; and the King told Sir Robert Walpole: "I know Carteret disapproves this whole affair." Both to the King and Queen on this occasion Sir Robert Walpole answered, smiling: "Lord Carteret has very good luck if, whilst he is doing everything he can to distress Your Majesty, he can make those very measures part of his merit, by disavowing them here whilst he advises them there." And Sir Robert told Lord Hervey, he was sure it was Lady Sundon had done Lord Carteret this piece of service with the Queen. "For, as I can," said he, "my Lord, get many things (in more places than one) out of the husband which I can never pump out of the wife, so my good Lord (I had almost said King) Sundon told me this morning, as he came from London with me in my chariot, that he heard my Lord Carteret disapproved extremely the Prince's conduct, and said it was very imprudent and very unjustifiable." Lord Hervey told Sir Robert that, when the Queen had talked in this strain to him, he had said it was not very probable the Prince, who, she knew, was the greatest coward in the world, should not have asked advice on an occasion where he had reason to be, and was, more frightened than he had ever been before; nor was it very probable His Royal Highness should have sent for Lord Carteret, Lord Winchilsea, Lord Chesterfield, Mr. Pulteney, and the Duke of Marlborough, only to consult them about a nurse for his new daughter. He told Sir Robert, too (to save Lady Sundon), that he believed the principal infusers of these opinions in the Queen in favour of Lord Carteret were Sir Luke Schaub and Monsieur de Montandre, who were really of that class, and the chief; but Lady Sundon, too, had her share in these intrigues. However, it being notorious that Lord

1737 Carteret went every day to the Prince, and for many hours, whilst he made his emissaries at Hampton Court say he never went above once a week, and that only in form, and that he would have nothing to do in so silly an affair, the King and Queen at last began to be undeceived. The Princess Caroline said she did not think this impudence at all extraordinary in Lord Carteret. "For if mama was to see him there," said she, "he is capable of endeavouring to persuade her the devil had taken his figure, *seulement pour lui rendre un mauvais office auprès d'elle.*" This shallow artifice; therefore, of Lord Carteret's in denying what could not long be concealed, lost its effect so soon where only it was designed to operate, and where it astonishingly did operate for some time, that both King and Queen recurred to their former way of talking of him, and said he was lately become *un menteur si outré, qu'il y avoit aussi peu de bon-sens que de bonne-foi dans sa conduite*; and Lord Hervey mentioning at this time, with some pity, a family misfortune that had happened to Lord Carteret, by his only son being run away from school, not to be heard of, and thought to be married privately and meanly, the King said: "Why do you pity him? I think it is a very just punishment that, whilst he is acting the villainous part he does in debauching the minds of other people's children, he should feel a little what it is to have an undutiful puppy of a son himself." Mr. Pulteney owned publicly that the Prince had been in the wrong, but said he had made such ample submissions that the King and Queen ought to look upon them as a full atonement.

When Lord Hervey said to the Queen that he thought Pulteney's behaviour and discourse much the most reasonable and sensible on this occasion, the Queen replied: "Oh, my Lord, you are partial to Mr. Pulteney, but I have done with him." Lord Hervey said he certainly had great faults both to himself and to other people, from his passions and his irresolution; but that he was sure he had

no reason to be partial to him, and yet could not help 1737
thinking him much the ablest man that he knew of any
figure or note in the Opposition, as well as the most
beloved.

The Princess Emily not only at this time was extremely
out of her brother's favour, but had long been so; and had
contrived her affairs so ill, that, whilst her brother was
railing at her for having betrayed him when she played
the mediatrix and was pretending to serve him, her mother
trusted her as little as her brother declared he ever would
do for the future; nay, her brother went so far as to say,
that, if ever he came to an *éclaircissement* with the King,
he would let His Majesty know there was nothing she
could now say to the disadvantage of the son that she had
not before said of the father; and, though the Prince's
credit for truth was not at present very high, yet the known
character of Her Royal Highness the Princess Emily
would have authenticated most things in that style he
could have related to her prejudice.

The Princess Caroline spoke of her brother with very
little reserve, but her conduct was uniform. She had never
been his friend, nor ever affected it; she had always loved
her mother, and always professed it; and as all the rancour
of the Prince seemed directed against the Queen, the
Princess Caroline could not speak of him with common
temper, and hardly, indeed, with common decency. She
bid Mr. Dunoyer, the dancing-master, who (except the
hours he was obliged to be at Hampton Court) was the
Prince and Princess's constant companion, tell the Prince,
when he asked him what they said at Hampton Court of
his late expedition to London, that the Princess Caroline
declared they all, except the Princess, deserve to be
hanged; and added: "I know, Monsieur Dunoyer, you
would tell this again, though I did not give you leave;
but I say it with no other design than that you should
repeat it"; and, the next time Dunoyer came to Hamp-
ton Court, the Princess Caroline asked him if he had

1737 delivered her message. "Oui, Madame," said Monsieur Dunoyer. "Et l'avez-vous dit dans les mêmes paroles?" "Oui, Madame; j'ai dit: 'Monseigneur, savez-vous ce que Madame la Princesse Caroline m'a chargé de vous dire? Elle dit, Monseigneur, sauve le respect que je vous dois, que votre Altesse Royale mérite d'être pendu.'" "Et qu'est-ce qu'il a répondu?" "Madame, il a craché dans le feu, et puis il a répondu: 'Ah! vous savez la manière de la Caroline; elle est toujours comme ça.'" "Quand vous le reverrez, Monsieur Dunoyer, vous n'avez qu'à lui dire encore de ma part que sa réponse étoit aussi sotté que sa conduite."

Monsieur Dunoyer, who was a sort of licensed spy on both sides, told the Princess Caroline, too, that the Princess, having by chance overheard some whisper she was not designed to hear, had got some little suspicion of the King and Prince being ill together, and that there was some new bustle since she was brought to bed; upon which she had watched her opportunity when the Prince and Lady Archibald were retired, and he only left with Her Royal Highness, to ask him what was the matter, adding, with great vehemence, that she would know; and, when he pretended ignorance, she burst into tears, flew into a greater passion than he thought her capable of, and by these means had forced him, half out of fear and half out of pity, to tell her all he knew.

This must seem incredible to anybody who knows not that the Prince kept this gilded piece of royal conjugality in such profound ignorance of all his political affairs that, at the time I am now writing, I believe she has yet never heard of the dispute last session between her husband and her father-in-law in Parliament. His Royal Highness looked upon this conduct towards his wife as a piece of manly grandeur, and used always to say a Prince should never talk to any woman of politics, or make any use of a wife but to breed; and that he would never make the ridiculous figure his father had done in letting his wife

govern him or meddle with business, which no woman was 1737
fit for.

The ninth day after the Princess was brought to bed the Queen with her two eldest daughters went again from Hampton Court to see the Princess. The Prince, when they came to St. James's, went no further than the door of his wife's bedchamber to meet Her Majesty, and the whole time she stayed (which was about an hour), spoke not one single word either to her or his sisters, but was industriously civil and affectedly gay with all those of their suite who were present. Lady Archibald Hamilton brought in the child, and showing the Queen its hands, asked Her Majesty if she did not think the Princess had the prettiest little hand she had ever seen, and exactly like the Prince's. The Queen asked once or twice for her coaches, which were gone to have the horses changed, and said she feared she was troublesome, fears which nobody in the room endeavoured to remove, by saying one word in answer; and when she went away, the Prince, who could not avoid leading her to her coach, though he had not spoken one word to her, yet at the coach door, to make the mob believe he was never wanting in any respect, he kneeled down in the dirty street, and kissed her hand. As soon as this operation was over, he put Her Majesty into the coach, and then returned to the steps of his own door, leaving his sisters to get through the dirt and the mob, by themselves, as they could; nor did there come to the Queen any message either from the Prince or Princess, to thank her afterwards for the trouble she had taken, or for the honour she had done them in this visit.

It is easy to imagine, after such a reception, that the Queen made no more of these trips to St. James's, and the King told her she was well enough served for thrusting her nose where it had been shit upon already. This extraordinary expression of His Majesty's (though none of the cleanest) I could not help relating just in the words the Queen reported it to me.

1737 Upon a report at this time that the Prince, who determined to make himself popular wherever he could at his father's expense, intended to set himself at the head of a party next Session to repeal the Test Act, Sir Robert Walpole sent to Bishop Hoadly to desire to speak with him, knowing, if any such resolution was taken, that he would be one of the first people who would be acquainted with it. There had been long (as I have before related) a coldness between Bishop Hoadly and Sir Robert Walpole, which even his making him Bishop of Winchester had not removed; and as soon as the Bishop came into the room, his Lordship began with thanking him for this renewal of an honour, and mark of friendship, which it was so long since he had received; and when Sir Robert opened to him the occasion of his sending for him, the Bishop assured Sir Robert Walpole he had not yet heard anything from the Prince about it; and added, though he always had been, and always should be, in conscience and opinion for the Repeal of the Test Act abstractedly considered, yet he had always too been so strongly of opinion that the Prince should not be set up in opposition to the King, that he thought it would be buying even the Repeal of the Test Act too dear, to make the King's distress in a family quarrel the price of it; and would therefore give no encouragement to it upon that foot, but declare to the Prince, as he had done on several other occasions, and particularly that of His Royal Highness making his son, Mr. Hoadly, his chaplain, that no new obligations whatever should make him at any time forget those he had to the King in putting him where he was. Sir Robert Walpole was so pleased with the Bishop of Winchester's behaviour in this conference, that he told Lord Hervey: "You know I have not ever disguised to you my being dissatisfied with your friend, nor do I now say it to flatter you, that, upon my word, it was impossible for any man to behave better than he did to me yesterday at Chelsea; and you will find by the King and Queen that I do not

deceive you in saying I have done him ample justice 1737 there, and given him all the merit you or he could wish: though I need not tell you that neither I nor you can ever make them love him."

Among many other things that were said to make this new-born Princess a favourite of the public, it was remarked by some of the Prince's Court that, if ever she came to the Crown, what had been so much wished ever since the Hanover family came to the throne by every one who understood and wished the interest of England must happen; which was, the disjoining the Electorate of Hanover from the Crown of England. It was certainly a great omission in the Act of Succession, that a renunciation of that Electorate was not made one of the original conditions in the Act of Settlement; and as it was to be wished that oversight, or neglect, might be retrieved by some Act in present, yet with a male heir to the throne it was thought impossible. When the Queen told Lord Hervey it was a thing the King had once resolved to go about, not to be done in present, but to mortify his eldest son, and provide for his second, Lord Hervey had done all he could to forward the scheme, being delighted to have such an opportunity at once to gratify his hatred and resentment against the Prince, and lend his aid and assistance to so public a benefit. But though the King was very willing to put this project in execution, the Queen, either from fearing the vengeance of the Prince, or from a qualm of conscience, which she said was her reason, demurred in giving her consent, saying notwithstanding the behaviour of the Prince she could not bring herself to think it just to deprive him of what he was born to. Lord Hervey, hearing at this time a slight report that the friends of the Prince had persuaded him to make the offer in Parliament of giving up the succession of the Electorate of Hanover to his brother, on condition he might have his £100,000 a year in present, told the Queen what was said. The Queen said there were few marks of folly she did not believe her

1737 son capable of giving, but this was too extravagant to find credit with her. Lord Hervey said that he knew the Prince so capable of being persuaded to anything by those who had the present possession of him, though that possession was so precarious, that he did not think it at all impossible the Prince might now have such intentions, though he might not pursue them. The way Lord Hervey came to know there was such a talk in the Prince's Court was by one Dr. Clark, a clergyman, to whom Mr. Oglethorpe, a member of Parliament, had told it, assuring him, at the same time, that he had been consulted about it, and that the pulse of other members of Parliament, to his knowledge, had been felt upon the subject, to try how such a proposal would be relished. The Queen asked Lord Hervey how he could believe there was any foundation for such a report, and what inducement it was possible the Prince could have to make such a voluntary abdication; telling Lord Hervey, at the same time, that she was sure the Prince looked upon Hanover as a retreat in case the Jacobites in England ever got the better; and that the Prince, the excise year, had told her that Sir Robert Walpole had managed matters so, that His Royal Highness believed the whole family would be driven out of the kingdom, and that, for his part, he would be one of the first to run to Hanover, as if the devil was at his heels. Lord Hervey replied that the Prince had at present so high a notion of his own popularity here, that how disagreeable soever his father might be, or how likely soever to be sent out of the kingdom, His Royal Highness thought himself in no such situation, and in no danger of incurring the same fate. "In the next place," said Lord Hervey, "Your Majesty knows how much he is set upon making himself popular; the people about him tell him nothing can so effectually gratify that desire as this step; that what he gives up is at best a reversionary, remote, uncertain possession, and that what he will get for it will double his present income; and that, as things now stand, this is the only chance he has to

obtain this augmentation, the principal object of his present wishes." 1737

"The mean fool!" interrupted the Queen, "the poor-spirited beast! I remember you laughed at me when I told you once this avaricious and sordid monster was so little able to resist taking a guinea on any terms, if he saw it before his nose, that if the Pretender offered him £500,000 for the reversion of this Crown, he would say, 'Give me the money.' What do you think now?" "I think (replied Lord Hervey) just as I did, Madam, upon that question—because it would not be enough: but I think the present a very different case." "Well (said the Queen), I thought it cruel and unjust to pull out his eyes; but if he likes to pull one of them out himself, and give it my dear William, I am satisfied; I am sure I shall not hinder him, I shall jump at it; for though, between you and I, I had as lief go and live upon a dunghill myself, as go to Hanover, yet for William it will be a very good morsel; and, for the £50,000 a year, I dare say the King will be very glad to give it; and, if the silly beast insists upon it, I will give him £25,000 more, the half of my revenue, and live as I can, upon shillings and pennies."

The Queen then bade Lord Hervey tell Sir Robert Walpole what he had heard; but to both of them Lord Hervey refused to tell how he had heard it.

Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey he did not think it at all unlikely for the Prince to make this bargain, if it was proposed to him; or to offer to make it, if he was advised so to do: but that he did not see what interest his present counsellors could have in advising it. Lord Hervey replied, that their interest and view was, showing the people of England they could, even out of power, do this country more good than the Ministers could do, or, at least, had done, in power. "But their interest, whilst in opposition (said Sir Robert Walpole), is not to do anything to end the dispute, and make up the quarrel between the King and the Prince." "Nor will this measure

1737 have that effect (replied Lord Hervey); it will only make the head of their party stronger by £50,000 a year; remove the danger of his deserting them to get it; and they will afterwards go on in opposing, with greater riches and greater popularity on their side. Besides this, there will be another piece of policy in this proceeding, for as there neither is nor ought to be anything so much desired by the people of England as the disjunction of the Hanover dominions from this Crown, so, besides the merit the Prince will have in making this sacrifice, it must double the odium of the King's reign, as the King's life alone will be the means of postponing so desirable an event; and, consequently, the Prince must imagine, when he has once consented to this separation, the nation will be as impatient for his father's death as himself, for fear anything should happen to defeat so desirable an expectation, and continue so inconvenient a union."

Sir Robert Walpole then asked Lord Hervey how he thought the King and Queen would relish this scheme; to which Lord Hervey replied: "I am sure, Sir, the King had a mind to execute it himself last winter; but how far the Prince's having a mind to it, or the proposal coming from His Royal Highness, or the paying £50,000 for it, may alter His Majesty's inclination, I am unable to guess. As to the Queen, she has always wavered, from what motive I know not. She says the injustice of the scheme towards the Prince has prevented her from lending her aid to make it effectual, and that it was upon that account she had never produced some deed, instrument, or writing (I know not what it is) that she had got drawn for this purpose. You know, Sir, she expresses herself so by halves sometimes, that one cannot comprehend her perfectly; and one does not care either to say, 'Madam, I do not understand what you design to tell me'; or, 'Madam, I desire to understand a little more than you seem to design to tell me.' " "Do you then (interrupted Sir Robert Walpole) imagine this thing ever went so far as to have

any method for effecting it put into writing?" Lord Her- 1737
vey, finding by this question that Sir Robert Walpole
knew nothing of this writing, and that he had gone too
far, tried to recede, by saying: "I did really, Sir, imagine
there was, but it was only, as I told you before, from col-
lecting, not from being told, and making conjectures from
half words and distant hints from the Queen; which, to
be sure, since you know nothing of this writing, I must
have mistaken." "I dare say (replied Sir Robert) you have
mistaken, for I do not believe there ever was any such
thing."

In what form this writing was I know not, but that
there was something of this kind in the Queen's posses-
sion is certain; and, I believe, drawn either by Mr. Poyntz
or some of the German ministers. The Queen told Lord
Hervey there was such a paper; she told him she had
burned two drafts, and had now another by her, but not
explaining in what manner it was done. Lord Hervey,
who had such frequent opportunities with the King and
Queen of knowing things by pieces, made it a general rule,
and swerved not from it, never to seem inquisitive by
pressing to know one circumstance more than was told
him voluntarily and without asking; nobody liking those
by whom, on reflection, they find they were drawn in to
tell more than they designed, or than they were willing
to communicate. For, besides the disagreeable circum-
stance of thinking, on such occasions, one is more in the
power of another than one desires to be, there is added to
that, the mortifying reflection of imagining it was their
superior skill that put one so; which, of course, makes one
love that person less for what is past, and sets one more
upon one's guard for what is to come; and though, there-
fore, from anybody who is to give one information casually
on any particular occasion, it is right and politic to get
any way all one can out of them, yet the manner of be-
haviour to people from whom one seeks accidental intelli-
gence, and those with whom one desires to live in habitual

1737 confidence, ought to be very different, as in one case the present is the only consideration, and in the other it is one of the least; since I had rather discover in anybody I wanted to have confide in me a hundred marks of omitting to confide in me, than one of their having confided and repenting it.

Sir Robert Walpole said he doubted not but, in case this proposal was ever made in Parliament, it might be carried with universal concurrence and approbation. "Carried! (replied Lord Hervey) there is indeed no doubt of that. But should it be proposed, could you stop it, if you had a mind?" "Oh, my Lord (answered Sir Robert), there is nothing I cannot stop in Parliament, if I set my face to it heartily; but, should this be done, it will ever after be such a series of rapaciousness to hoard at Hanover for the Duke's grandeur and profit, and the Queen's security and retreat, and Hanover in all foreign negotiations would so cross on all our measures, that it is impossible to foresee half the difficulties it would bring upon us; not but that I own, at the same time, it would in futurity be the greatest real benefit the sagacity of all mankind combined could procure for this country." "I am sure (said Lord Hervey) I am firmly of that opinion, and therefore heartily for the thing being any way done; and for risking all the present little inconveniences—which I call little because I am far (perhaps from less penetration) from seeing them in so strong a light as I perceive they glare upon you. In the first place, as to Hanover crossing on all your foreign negotiations, and your finding it mixed, and troublesomely mixed, in every consideration, is it not so now? Has it not been so ever since the Hanover family came here? And will it not continue so as long as the union of the dominions continues? And as to the Queen's hoarding there for herself, believe me, Sir, she will never go there. Though she would look on her English son as the devil, and her Hanover heir as an angel, she will stay in this paradise with her devil, sooner than go to that hell

with her angel. She has too much pleasure in grandeur to 1737
exchange that she has been accustomed to in this country
for the mean indigent scenes she knows she would be
reduced to there." "Oh! my Lord (interrupted Sir Robert),
you know not what fear will do even against her pride;
and with a promise from the Prince of quiet and safety
there, and menaces of perpetual plaguing and harassing
here, believe me, she would prefer the first, with her
£100,000 a year, besides a good round sum of ready
money, there, to anything she could propose to herself,
subject to so many hazards, here." Lord Hervey said he
should think her £100,000 a year would run much
greater hazards there, the people grumbling at so great
a sum going every year out of the kingdom, and the Prince
ready to redress that grievance, not so much for the good
of England, as to gratify his revenge upon her: and that
if nothing but the security of her jointure was in question,
those who advised her best would advise her to stay
here.

Sir Robert said it was a question of great moment, but
that the principal point for him to consider was what the
King and Queen wished really should be done in it. This
he said, too, to the Queen, when he talked to her upon this
subject, adding: "Pray, Madam, therefore, consider well
before you determine, and let me know, when you have
determined, without any disguise, what you wish should
be done, and whatever that is, I will answer for it, it shall
be done." In all the conferences he had with the King and
Queen on this matter, if anything passed more than what
I have related, I know it not; for nothing more was men-
tioned to me, either by the Queen or Sir Robert Walpole,
in their reports, than turning and repeating all the par-
ticulars I have already set down, one only excepted, and no
immaterial one, which I had forgot, and just now recurs
to my memory, which was Sir Robert's flattery to the King
and Queen by telling them both that he saw no reason, if
this bargain was to be struck, why the nation should not

1737 pay the purchase money to the Prince of £50,000 a year, since the benefit of the bargain was to accrue to the nation, and that there could be no pretence for the King's giving it out of his Civil List, when he was to get nothing by it.

On the 20th of August, in the morning, the King sent another written message to the Prince by his Lord in Waiting, as follows:

From the King at Hampton Court to the Prince at St. James's, by Lord Dunmore, Aug. 20, 1737.

It being now near three weeks since the Princess was brought to bed, His Majesty hopes there can be no inconvenience to the Princess, if Monday the twenty-ninth instant be appointed for baptizing the Princess, his grand-daughter; and having determined that His Majesty, the Queen, and the Duchess-Dowager of Saxe-Gotha, shall be Godfather and Godmothers, will send his Lord Chamberlain to represent himself, and the Queen's Lady of the Bedchamber to represent the Queen, and desires the Princess will order one of the ladies of her bedchamber to stand for the Duchess-Dowager of Saxe-Gotha, and the King will send to the Archbishop of Canterbury to attend and perform the ceremony.

In answer to this message, in the evening, the Prince, by Lord Carnarvon, sent again two letters to the King and Queen:

The Prince to the King, Aug. 20, 1737.

SIRE,

La Princesse et moi prenons la liberté de remercier très-humblement votre Majesté de l'honneur qu'elle veut bien faire à notre fille d'en être parrain. Les ordres que my Lord Dunmore m'a apporté sur ce sujet seront exécutés point à point. Je me conterois bien heureux si à cette occasion j'osois venir moi-même me mettre à vos pieds; rien ne m'en pourroit empêcher que la seule défense de votre Majesté. D'être privé de vos bonnes grâces est la chose du monde la plus affligeante pour moi, qui non seulement vous respecte mais, si j'ose me servir de ce terme, vous aime très-tendrement. Me permettez-vous encore une fois de vous supplier très-humblement de me pardonner une faute dans laquelle du moins l'intention n'avoit pas de part, et de me permettre de vous

refaire ma cour à votre levé. J'ose vous en conjurer instamment, 1737
comme d'une chose qui me rendra le repos. Je suis, avec toute la
soumission possible,

Sire, de votre Majesté,

Le très-humble et très-obéissant fils,

sujet, et serviteur,

FREDERICK.

To the Queen, the same date.

MADAME,

Permettez-moi de vous remercier très-humblement de
l'honneur que vous voulez bien faire à la Princesse et à moi d'être
marraine de notre fille. J'ai pris la liberté d'en faire nos remerciemens au
Roi par écrit; j'y ai ajouté mes douleurs de la situation où je me trouve.
Je vous supplie encore une fois, Madame, de m'y assister de vos bons
offices, qui ne peuvent jamais être employés dans un cas plus essen-
tiel à votre fils, qu'à le remettre dans les bonnes grâces de son père.
Je suis, avec tout le respect possible,

Madame,

Votre très-humble et très-obéissant fils et serviteur,

FREDERICK.

Though this letter to the King was conceived in these
submissive terms, yet the coldness of that to the Queen, and
the silly omission in never saying to her "Your Majesty,"
from one end of the letter to the other, provoked the
King so much that, after the receipt of these two letters,
he seemed more angry with his son than ever; and the
Queen, by her seeming indifference to this treatment,
and desiring the King not to resent this childish ill-judged
impertinence, incensed the King still more.

She had often told Lord Hervey that the Prince had
several times formerly given her to understand that his
rank was superior to hers, and that properly the Prince
of Wales's place was between the King and the Queen.
How he made it out God knows; or by what way of rea-
soning, when he allowed her to be called Queen, he could
dispute the title of Your Majesty being her due, I do not
comprehend. The Queen one day, in one of these disputes,
told him she could not imagine why he laboured this point

1737 so much in endeavouring to prove his rank superior to hers, "Since, believe me," said she, "my dear Fretz, let your quality be ever so great, the King, if I was to die, would never marry you."

Soon after the receipt of these letters the Queen fell ill of a violent fit of the gout, and on this occasion she first broke through the etiquette of the Court, by seeing Lord Hervey in her bed. But as she was confined to it for several days, she said it was too much to be in pain and ennuyer herself for want of company besides; and as she was too old to have the honour of being talked of for it, she would let Lord Hervey come in, and accordingly had him in her bedchamber almost the whole day, during the time of her confinement.

When Lord North was sent from the Prince to inquire after her health, Lord Hervey said he was sure he could dictate a much sincerer message from the Prince on this occasion than Lord North had delivered. Upon which the Queen and the Princess Caroline begging him to do it, he went with the Princess Caroline into the next room, and there wrote the following letter to the Queen, in the name of the Griff, which was a nickname the King had long ago given the Prince. This is the original paper:

The Griff to the Queen.

From myself and my cub, and eke from my wife,
I send my Lord North, notwithstanding our strife,
To Your Majesty's residence call'd Hampton Court,
Pour savoir, au vrai, comment on se porte.
For 't is rumour'd in town—I hope 't is not true—
Your foot is too big for your slipper or shoe.
If I had the placing your gout, I am sure
Your Majesty's toe less pain should endure;
For whilst I've so many curs'd things in my head,
And some stick in my stomach (as in Proverbs 't is said),
No just or good reason your good son can see
Why, when mine are so plagued, yours from plagues should be free.
Much more I've to say, but respect bids be brief:
And so I remain your undutiful Griff.

The Queen was extremely diverted with this letter, 1737 but Lord Hervey insisted upon having it back again to burn it.

On the 29th of August the christening was performed. The Duke of Grafton stood for the King, Lady Burlington for the Queen, and Lady Torrington, one of the Princess's ladies, for the Duchess-Dowager of Saxe-Gotha. The young Princess was christened Augusta; and the Prince, as soon as the christening was over, sent his treasurer, Mr. Herbert, to tell everybody belonging to his family then at Court, that the Prince would not have his daughter called Princess Augusta, but according to the old English fashion, the Lady Augusta, and that she should be called Her Royal Highness, though his sisters had not been so when his father was Prince of Wales. This Mr. Herbert was a commoner of a great estate, who had voted for the Prince last year in the question of the £100,000; and to reward that service, Mr. Hedges dying just at the rising of the Parliament, the Prince nominated, the day Hedges died, Mr. Herbert to succeed him; though Mr. Herbert had not voted against the Court in any one vote but that of the £100,000, and declared he never would.

The day after the christening, the Prince sent Lord North with two more letters to Hampton Court to the King and Queen, to thank them for the honour they had done his daughter, which letters were as follows:

The Prince to the King, by Lord North.

ST. JAMES'S, ce 30 d'Août, 1737.

SIRE,

C'est avec tout le respect possible que j'ose remercier encore une fois votre Majesté de l'honneur qu'elle a bien voulu faire à la Princesse et à moi d'être parrain de notre fille. Je ne saurois laisser passer cette occasion sans réitérer ma demande du pardon que je lui ai demandé si souvent. Je souhaiterois trouver des paroles qui puissent fléchir le cœur paternel de votre Majesté; s'il y en avoient qui puissent marquer davantage ma douleur et mon respect envers vous, je puis assurer votre Majesté que je m'en servirois. Il ne

1737 me reste donc plus rien à dire que de vous conjurer encore une fois de me rétablir encore dans vos bonnes grâces, et de vous assurer que rien au monde ne changera le tendre respect que je vous dois, étant, avec beaucoup de soumission,

Sire, de votre Majesté,

Le très-humble et très-obéissant fils,

sujet, et serviteur,

FREDERICK.

The Prince to the Queen, by Lord North.

ST. JAMES'S, ce 30 d'Août, 1737.

MADAME,

Je crois être de mon devoir de vous remercier encore une fois très-humblement de l'honneur que vous avez fait à la Princesse et à moi d'être marraine de notre fille. Je suis très-mortifié que la défense du Roi m'empêche de le faire de bouche: rien ne m'arrêtera sans cela. Je me flatte que la continuation de vos bons offices, joint à la lettre que je me suis donné l'honneur d'écrire au Roi sur ce sujet, m'en procureront la permission, et que j'aurai bientôt la satisfaction de reparôître devant vous. Je suis, avec tout le respect imaginable,

Madame,

Votre très-humble et très-obéissant fils et serviteur,

FREDERICK.

The Prince avoiding in this letter to call the Queen Your Majesty, as he had done in the last, plainly showed that the other was not accident, but that he had on purpose taken this simple method of showing his resentment. The Queen sent these letters by Lord Hervey to Sir Robert Walpole, and bid Lord Hervey tell Sir Robert not to fail to let her see him before he saw the King. What Her Majesty wanted with Sir Robert was, to agree with him on the substance of a message to be sent to the Prince to turn him out of St. James's, before Sir Robert spoke to the King upon it. When Sir Robert Walpole came back from this interview with the Queen, having been also afterward with the King, he told Lord Hervey that the resolution was to leave the child with the Princess, and

not to take it (as the late King had taken this King's 1737 children, upon the quarrel in the last reign) lest any accident might happen to this royal little animal, and the world in that case accuse the King and Queen of having murdered it for the sake of the Duke. Besides that the Queen, to give her her due, though she always spoke of the Princess as a driveller, always spoke of her, too, as one whom she would not displease, one who had never offended her, or done anything wrong; and, consequently, one who did not deserve such harsh usage as the being separated from her only child.

Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey he liked, on every occasion, to hear other people's opinions whilst he was forming his own, and, therefore, desired him to put down in writing what, if he were to advise the King on this occasion, he would have him say. And though the other messages had been all drawn in the third person, in the nature of memorandums only for the messenger, yet, as this was to go in the King's own name, and to be signed by him, Sir Robert Walpole bid Lord Hervey draw it up in the form of a letter, which Lord Hervey did in the following words; not a little pleased with a commission that put it in his power to make use of the King's character and authority to express and gratify his resentment against the Prince:

It is in vain for you to hope I can be so far deceived by your empty professions, wholly inconsistent with all your actions, as to think they in any manner palliate or excuse a series of the most insolent and premeditated indignities offered to me and the Queen, your mother.

You never gave the least notice to me or the Queen of the Princess's being breeding or with child till about three weeks before the time when you yourself have owned you expected her to be brought to bed, and removed her from the place of my residence for that purpose. You twice in one week carried her away from Hampton Court with an avowed design of having her lie-in in town without consulting me or the Queen, or so much as communicating your intentions to either of us. At your return you industriously

1737 concealed everything relating to this important affair from our knowledge; and, last of all, you clandestinely hurried the Princess to St. James's in circumstances not fit to be named, and less fit for such an expedition.

This extravagant and undutiful behaviour in a matter of such great consequence as the birth of an heir to my crown, to the manifest peril of the Princess and her child (whilst you pretend your regard for her was your motive), inconsistent with the natural right of all parents, and in violation of your double duty to me as your father and as your King, is what cannot be excused by any false plea, so repugnant to the whole tenor of your conduct, of the innocence of your intentions, or atoned for by specious pretences or plausible expressions.

Your behaviour for a long time has been so void of duty and regard to me, even before this last open proof you have given to all the world of your contempt for me and my authority, that I have long been justly offended at it; nor will I suffer any part of any of my palaces to be longer the resort and refuge of all those whom discontent, disappointment, or disaffection have made the avowed opposers of all my measures; who espouse you only to distress me, and who call you the head, whilst they make you the instrument of a faction that acts with no other view than to weaken my authority in every particular, and can have no other end in their success but weakening the common interest of my whole family.

My pleasure, therefore, is that you and all your family remove from St. James's as soon as ever the safety and convenience of the Princess will permit.

I will leave the care of my grand-daughter to the Princess till the time comes when I shall think it proper to give directions for her education.

To this I will receive no reply. When you shall, by a consistency in your words and actions, show you repent of your past conduct and are resolved to return to your duty, paternal affection may then, and not till then, induce me to forgive what paternal justice now obliges me to resent.

Sir Robert Walpole, after two days' consideration, made several alterations in this paper, and every one of them an amendment, and then showed it again to Lord Hervey, desiring him, at the same time, not to own to anybody, not even the Queen, that he had seen it. "I need not tell you," said he, "that she is main good" (that was

his expression) "at pumping; but be sure you do not let 1737
her get it out of you. I shall not show it to her herself till
the Duke of Newcastle and my Lord Chancellor have seen
it. I shall only talk with her again upon the matter which
it is to contain; for should I show her the paper itself, the
Chancellor and his Grace would complain they were tied
up from giving any opinion on alterations, because it
would be combating hers; and, therefore, I will be able
to say to them it is open to their free correction."

On the other hand, the Queen, telling Lord Hervey
of this paper, gave him the same injunctions Sir Robert
had done, not to own to anybody, not even to Sir Robert,
that she had spoke to him about it; and by her, too, Lord
Hervey found, notwithstanding what Sir Robert had said
of concerting only the substance with her, that she had
seen it in writing. These sort of transactions often put
Lord Hervey in a very disagreeable, as well as delicate,
situation, from his hearing so many things from Sir
Robert and the Queen, some of which he might confer
upon in common with them, others which he might not;
some that had particular circumstances only which he was
to seem ignorant of, others which he was often at a loss to
remember who had told him; but the most general rule
he had to go by was never to begin any of these subjects
before the King, and always, when they were begun, to
seem as if it was the first time he had heard of them.

As the Queen's confidence in Lord Hervey every day
increased, Sir Robert Walpole's jealousy of him increased
too, not from his being in the rank of a rival in his power,
but from a weakness in this great man's composition,
which made him grudge this show of favour even where,
I believe, he had not the least suspicion, or where, I am
very sure, at least, he had no reason given him to justify
suspicion, that this favour would ever be employed to his
disservice. For Lord Hervey always looked upon Sir
Robert as his benefactor, who had placed him in that
situation; as an able master, from whom he had learned

1737 all he knew in the beginning of the secrets of the Court, and most of what he knew of the policy requisite for his conduct there; and was sensible it was to his favour, protection, and commendations, that he owed originally his having any credit there. But that credit was now higher than Sir Robert wished it; and though Lord Hervey did not know that he endeavoured to destroy or weaken it, yet he plainly perceived, after the Queen had accidentally told Sir Robert Walpole of her having talked of things to Lord Hervey which Sir Robert had not communicated to him, or sent messages by him to Sir Robert, that Sir Robert did not like it, which made Lord Hervey always cautious of bragging of such favours. But he could not venture to desire the Queen to be more cautious in concealing them; and as Sir Robert knew he did not want any assistance from Lord Hervey, he was uneasy at his having any power to hurt him, though he was not apprehensive of its being so employed.

When the Lord Chancellor and the Duke of Newcastle had perused and cooked this message, it was shown to the King; and the Cabinet Council, the day before it was to be sent, was summoned to make it their act. At this meeting of the Cabinet Council Sir Robert Walpole, who did this sort of work with more strength and perspicuity than any man I ever knew, ran through every step of the Prince's conduct this summer, by way of preface to reading the paper which he said he had drawn up in pursuance of the King's positive commands, who was determined to suffer the Prince no longer to reside in any of his palaces. There were many of the Cabinet, as the Duke of Newcastle, the Duke of Richmond, and Lord Pembroke, who spoke as if they wished this measure had not been insisted on by the King, and that some means could be found out to make up the quarrel; and all were for softening as much as possible, if it was absolutely necessary these orders should go, the terms in which they were sent.

Sir Robert Walpole said the Cabinet Council being

summoned by the King, not to give advice whether these 1737 orders should be sent or not, but to agree upon the form, it was unnecessary to deliberate on objections to their being sent; and though in this situation he might be very naturally excused giving his opinion on the expediency and propriety of sending such orders, yet he was very free to declare, if his advice was asked even on that point, he should be for sending them. "I wish," continued he, "as zealously as any of your Lordships can do for a reconciliation; but I think (as paradoxical as it may sound) this thorough breach the likeliest way to attain that end. Should the King seem to receive these letters from the Prince as an atonement for the fault he has committed and send to-morrow to St. James's to say he will see him, what advantage would the King reap from it? Or would anybody call this a reconciliation? Would the Prince recede for this reason from pushing his money dispute in Parliament? Or would he be less afraid after this of offending his father or opposing his measures, when he saw his father so afraid of coming to an open rupture that nobody dare advise His Majesty not to take words as a compensation for actions, or not to show himself as ready on every offence to compound as his son to irritate, and as desirous to retreat as the Prince to attack? The King, my Lords, if he is in the right, must stand the battle and must conquer, and those who advise him to decline it must advise him to show he thinks himself in the wrong, or the weakest. When he has conquered he may forgive, but forgiving before he has conquered, is being conquered and patching up a peace neither honourable in present nor possible to be lasting."

Though Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey as soon as he came from council, what he had said there, he refused to tell him who had made it necessary to say so much; and told Lord Hervey, as the King and Queen would never forgive those people if they knew them, he intended not to report to them what he had reported to

1737 him, for fear they should ask the same question Lord Hervey had done, "who had made it necessary?"—and would therefore sink the opposition to this measure and the defence, losing the merit of the last himself, to save others from the demerit of the first. But he bragged of a lenity he did not practice, for he told it all to the Queen and the Queen to Lord Hervey.

The morning before the message went, the Queen at breakfast talking the whole over, said several times, lifting up her eyes to Heaven, that watered not with the remains of any maternal affection: "I hope in God I shall never see the monster's face again. Thank God it is over, and if I should have the misfortune ever to be in his house, I promise you I will not stay to be turned out." "You once thought," said she to Lord Hervey, "you fool, to be so imposed upon, that he loved me." "I did indeed," replied Lord Hervey, "but I never thought people may not alter." "You thought, too," said the Queen, "that he loved you, poor my Lord Hervey. He laughed at you all that while for believing him and for fancying you had any interest in him. I told you he never loved anybody; he cannot love anybody. But you will all fancy you know him better than me, and when I say he is worse than any of you think him, and yet is not so great a fool as you think him, you will imagine I say it from some little silly pride of a mother, or from some partiality of a mother. God knows my heart, I feel no more of a mother towards him than if he was no relation, and if I was to see him in hell I should feel no more for him than I should for any other rogue that ever went there. And yet once, I say it before one of my children" (the Princess Caroline was by), "I would have given up all my children for him. I was fond of that monster, I looked upon him as one that was to make the happiness of my life, and now I wish he had never been born." "Pray Mama," interrupted the Princess Caroline, "do not throw away your wishes for what cannot happen, but wish he may *crever*, and that we may all go about

with smiling faces, glad hearts, and crape and hoods for 1737 him."

Whilst the Queen, Princess Caroline and Lord Hervey were discoursing on this subject, the King came into the room, and the Queen telling him what they had been talking of, he said: "I am weary of the puppy's name, I wish I was never to hear it again, but at least I shall not be plagued any more with seeing his nasty face. Not but I could forgive him all he has done to me, but I can never forgive him his behaviour to you" (speaking to the Queen). "I must say you have been an excellent mother to all your children, and if any of them behave ill to you they deserve to be hanged. I never loved the puppy well enough to have him ungrateful to me, but to you he is a monster, and the greatest villain that ever was born." Then turning to Lord Hervey he continued: "I have scolded the Queen oftener for taking that rascal's part, and have had more quarrels with her when she has been making silly excuses for his silly conduct, than ever I had with her on all other subjects put together. And now you see," said he, turning to the Queen, "how you are repayed for your nonsense. I always told you how it would be, and you deserve it; for it was really a silly weakness in you that was unpardonable. When one's children behave well to one, one certainly must be a brute not to behave well to them; but when they behave ill, they deserve to be worse used than any other people because the ties they break through are stronger. There are degrees in all these things. Bad subjects are very provoking; bad servants are still more provoking; and bad children are the most provoking of all."

The King then ran through all the faults of the Prince's conduct towards him, and when he spoke of the impertinent manner in which he had asked to be married, said the Prince had excepted against the Princess of Denmark, which was the properest match in Europe, and he believed only for that reason. Lord Hervey said he had heard she was old, ugly, crooked, and a dwarf. The King said she

1737 was not handsome, and was low, but very well shaped, and but 27 years old. "If he insisted on not having a crooked woman," said the Queen, "he has chosen but ill." "It is certain," said the King, "when I saw her at Herrenhausen she did not appear so. It is true she was in a sacque and that might hide it, and she was in nightclothes which became her much better than the frightful dress her women now put her on. She seemed to me an ill likeness of Ann, but I did not desire him to trust to me. I indulged him in sending a servant he said he could confide in to see her, and upon the report of that man he took his resolutions. Besides, for Protestant Princesses there is not great choice of matches. The Princess of Denmark he would not have. The Princesses of Prussia have a madman for their father, and I did not think ingrafting my half-witted coxcomb upon a madwoman would mend the breed."

The King then named another family I have forgot (I think it was the Duke or Prince of Würtemberg) in which he said the grandmother had had the madness of not letting her husband lie with her after the first child for fear of spoiling her shape, and the great-grandmother the madness of letting anybody lie with her that pleased.

A great deal more passed in this conversation (that was a very entertaining one) which I have forgot.

After the Cabinet Council had on Friday morning agreed on the message and the King that evening signed it, the next day in the evening the following paper was sent.

From the King at Hampton Court to the Prince at St. James's, Sept. 10, 1737, by the Duke of Grafton, Lord Chamberlain, the Duke of Richmond, Master of the Horse, and Lord Pembroke, Groom of the Stole.

The professions you have lately made in your letters of your particular regard to me are so contradictory to all your actions, that I cannot suffer myself to be imposed upon by them.

You know very well you did not give the least intimation to me or to the Queen that the Princess was with child or breeding until

within less than a month of the birth of the young Princess; you removed the Princess twice in the week immediately preceding the day of her delivery from the place of my residence, in expectation, as you have voluntarily declared, of her labour; and both times upon your return you industriously concealed from the knowledge of me and the Queen every circumstance relating to this important affair; and you at last, without giving any notice to me or to the Queen, precipitately hurried the Princess from Hampton Court in a condition not to be named. After having thus, in execution of your own determined measures, exposed both the Princess and her child to the greatest perils, you now plead surprise and your tenderness for the Princess as the only motives that occasioned these repeated indignities, offered to me and to the Queen your mother. 2737

This extravagant and undutiful behaviour in so essential a point as the birth of an heir to my crown is such an evidence of your premeditated defiance of me, and such a contempt of my authority and of the natural right belonging to your parents, as cannot be excused by the pretended innocence of your intentions, nor palliated or disguised by specious words only.

But the whole tenor of your conduct for a considerable time has been so entirely void of all real duty to me that I have long had reason to be highly offended with you.

And until you withdraw your regard and confidence from those by whose instigation and advice you are directed and encouraged in your unwarrantable behaviour to me and to the Queen, and until you return to your duty, you shall not reside in my palace, which I will not suffer to be made the resort of them who, under the appearance of an attachment to you, foment the division which you have made in my family, and thereby weaken the common interest of the whole.

In this situation I will receive no reply; but when your actions manifest a just sense of your duty and submission, that may induce me to pardon what at present I most justly resent.

In the meantime it is my pleasure that you leave St. James's with all your family, when it can be done without prejudice or inconvenience to the Princess.

I shall for the present leave to the Princess the care of my granddaughter, until a proper time calls upon me to consider of her education.

The Duke of Grafton, taking place by his office of both the other messengers, was ordered to read the message to the Prince, and then leave it with him. It was said His

1737 Royal Highness changed colour several times in this interview, and told the messengers, though he knew it would have been his duty to have sent an answer in writing if the King had not in his letter forbid him, yet, since His Majesty had done so, he had nothing to trouble them with. His Royal Highness then asked if there was any time fixed by the King for his departure from St. James's, to which Lord Pembroke answered that the King had only in the message said it should be when it could be done without prejudice or inconvenience to the Princess. The Prince then desiring the Lords Messengers to present his duty to the King, and say he was very sorry for what had happened, dismissed them; and they all three returned that night immediately to the King, to let him know what I have related. The first question the King asked was whether the Prince had made them wait, which the Prince had not done; but Lord Pembroke told me if he had, that they had all agreed to lie and say he had not. He told me, too, that the Prince's behaviour had been very civil, and very decent.

The next morning the Queen, at breakfast, every now and then repeated: "I hope, in God, I shall never see him again"; and the King, among many other paternal douceurs in his valediction to his son, said: "Thank God, to-morrow night the puppy will be out of my house." The Queen asked Lord Hervey if he thought the Prince would be mortified. "For my part," said she, "I believe he will be very glad; for I am sure last winter he wished to be turned out." Lord Hervey said: "There is a great deal of difference, Madam, between his being turned out on a parliamentary quarrel and for a personal family misbehaviour; and though he might wish it therefore in one case, he may be very sorry for it in the other. Those about him must see and feel this distinction, and cannot fail, though he should not find it out, to represent it to him." "Who about him," says the King, "will tell it him, or who about him indeed has sense enough to find out

anything? Who is there but boobies and fools, and madmen 1737 that he ever listens to?" Lord Hervey laughed, and the King went on: "Why, is it not so? Am I not in the right? There is my Lord Carnarvon, a hot-headed, passionate, half-witted coxcomb, with no more sense than his master; there is Townshend, a silent, proud, surly, wrong-headed booby; there is my Lord North, a very good poor creature, but a very weak man; there is my Lord Baltimore, who thinks he understands everything, and understands nothing, who wants to be well with both courts, and is well at neither and, *entre nous*, is a little mad; and who else of his servants can you name whom he listens to, unless it is that stuttering puppy, Johnny Lumley?"

As soon as the King went out of the room the Queen desired Lord Hervey to send a copy of this message to his father the Earl of Bristol, saying: "I know your father to be a very honest, well-intentioned man, and such men one is always glad to have think one in the right; though I will tell you his faults as well as his merits. He is very sensible, and means very well; has always been a well-wisher to our family, and I am sure would go as far as anybody to support us if he thought the family in danger; but he is so wedded to what he calls the old Whig principles that, for fear of departing from them, he would never consent to the taking of the steps necessary to preserve us till it would be too late; and he imagines that the present times will admit of the same measures and manner of acting that were proper just after the Revolution; whereas things are in a very different situation. At that time the majority of the nation were apprehensive of Popery and tyranny, and were afraid, if King James should come back, that he would have more power than ever he had, and the Crown be absolute. The party against the Jacobites was then therefore more numerous and more united; whereas now the Whigs are divided, and those that are against our family are always telling those whom they want to seduce, that a new revolution would bring the power of the Crown

1737 still lower, as the Pretender would be glad of the Crown on any terms; so that the same arguments that were made use of to keep out King James are now employed to bring back his son. Your father will not believe this to be the case; but from his general notions about liberty, and the constitution, and standing armies, would, without weighing the consequences, disband the army. And with regard to this family quarrel, with all the fine messages your silly mother carries him from my silly son, I am sure he thinks that monster very good-natured, a little weak perhaps, but very ill-used."

Lord Hervey replied: "Your Majesty knows I always speak to you with very little disguise both of my family and your own; and since you allow me to be so very sincere upon the subject of the last, I think I owe it to you not to be reserved in the first; and with regard to my father, though I love him very sincerely, I do not believe I am at all partial either to his head or his heart. He has certainly as good natural parts as any man that ever was born. They have been extremely well cultivated by a life spent for many years together not only in good company, but in much reading, made more useful by a very happy memory; this, joined to a natural cheerfulness, a natural complaisance, and as good a natural temper as your own (I can say no better of it), makes him very entertaining, very accommodating, and never offensive; and as he has all his senses as perfect, his conception as quick, and his memory as good, as ever it was at thirty years old, so, apart from his being my father, and his loving me better than anybody else in the world, which I firmly believe he does, I do assure you I know nobody's company out of this room in which I am better pleased, or half so easy; for whatever I know he knows, and as he is too sensible to expect anybody to be faultless, I talk to him of all my own weaknesses, and passions, and follies with as much unconcern as I do of other people's. In short he is safe, affectionate, and sincere, and I live with him just as

your daughter Caroline does with you. And as to his 1737
politics, I assure Your Majesty there are very, very
few things on which we do not think just alike; and
though I, from desiring to make a general system go on,
which upon the whole I approve, am forced to consent
to many spokes in that wheel which I had rather were left
out; yet he not having the same connection with the people
in power that I have, it is very natural for him to speak
of every point as a detached point, and not as a part of a
general system, and as I myself should speak of them were
I not in the King's service and consequently not under any
obligation to avoid obstructing a general scheme from my
particular opinion on particular points. And as to the
army, I believe he is no more against the army, from the
silly notion of its being dangerous to the liberties of this
country, as things now stand, than I am; but he thinks,
and so do I, that the expense of the army should, if it could,
be reduced; and that the people of England in general are
so averse to standing armies, and have had that aversion
so strongly and so long inculcated, that, whether reason-
ably or not, a standing army gives umbrage and gives a
handle to the enemies of the Government to increase the
disaffection. And here, perhaps, he and I differ in opinion;
he may think it safer, these things considered, to reduce
the army, but I own to you, from whatever cause the dis-
affection or the turbulent, seditious spirit at present in this
nation originally sprung, it is now come to such a height,
that I should think reducing the army a very dangerous
experiment. As to the messages he may have had from the
Prince by Lady Bristol, I know nothing particularly; but
I believe, Madam, he knows both these people as well as
we do; and though two heads, according to the proverb,
are always better than one, this case is an exception to that
rule, for their two heads, believe me, will never impose upon
his. He is a wise man and an honest man, and he has always
been a true friend to the Revolution principles and govern-
ment, though he never had an employment himself under

1737 any of the Princes that have sat on the throne since the Revolution. He is judicious, dispassionate, just, humane, and a thorough good and amiable man, and has lived long enough in the world to have this character of him (though given by his son) uncontroverted by anybody else."

The Queen let fall some tears whilst Lord Hervey was speaking, and said: "He is a happy as well as a good man to have as well as to deserve such a son; and your mother is a brute that deserves just such a beast as my son. I hope I do not; and wish with all my soul we could change, that they who are so alike might go together, and that you and I might belong to one another."

Sept. 11 The day after the message was sent to the Prince, it was signified by the Secretaries of State to all the foreign Ministers that it would be agreeable to the King if they would forbear going to the Prince; and a message was sent in writing to all Peers, Peeresses, and Privy Counsellors, that whoever went to the Prince's court should not be admitted into the King's presence. The guard too was taken away from the Prince; and though Sir Robert Walpole, at the instigation of the Duke of Newcastle and Duke of Grafton, endeavoured to persuade the King and Queen to let the Prince take the furniture of his apartments away with him, it was not allowed. The King said he had given the Prince £5,000, when he married, out of his pocket to set out with, besides £5,000 which was his wife's fortune; and that it had cost him above £50,000 more for one thing or other on that occasion, and positively he would not let his son carry the things away; and the Duke of Grafton was ordered to take care that nothing did go. When Lord Hervey, who was by when these orders were given, said that chests and those sort of things which were not ornamental, but to hold the Prince and Princess's things, must not be understood to be included, as their clothes could not be carried away like dirty linen in a basket, he was answered: "Why not? A basket is good enough for them." Sir Robert Walpole, in order to induce the King and Queen

to consent to this carrying away of the furniture, had told 1737 them it would disarm the Prince's party in Parliament of the argument of the necessary additional expense the Prince had this year incurred by being turned out of his father's house, and being obliged to buy everything new for another; but all would not do. The Queen pretended to consent (as Sir Robert told me), but I am sure she was as much against it as the King; and the King's perseverance in being against it, is a demonstration she was so.

Lord Carteret was at this time at his own house in Bedfordshire; Lord Chesterfield ill of a fever; and Mr. Pulteney gone to take the diversion of shooting in Norfolk; so that there was nobody about the Prince but the minor Council, who were all in the same strain of flattery, talking of the magnanimity and fortitude with which His Royal Highness received this shock. Lord Baltimore (the Queen told me) had compared His Royal Highness's bravery and resolution to that of Charles the Twelfth of Sweden; but where he found a particular similitude in their characters I know not.

All the letters that passed this year and the last between the King or Queen and the Prince or Princess are copied in these memoirs from the originals, which Lord Hervey had many days in his possession, given him by the Queen to range them in order; and whoever hereafter sees the originals will find them all docketed in his handwriting, assisted by the King in some parts, where he had forgotten by whom some particular papers were sent; and those names which are not in his handwriting, though mixed with it, are written by the King himself. The originals Lord Hervey had orders to give to Sir Robert Walpole; and when he obeyed those orders, Sir Robert Walpole told him: "When the Duke of Newcastle sees these letters indorsed by the King and you in conjunction, it will put him out of humour for a week at least; he'll say you are Closet Secretary to the King, whilst he is only Office Secretary."

1737 On Monday, September 12, the Prince and Princess and their whole family removed from St. James's to Kew; and Lord Carteret, Sir William Wyndham, and Mr. Pulteney having been sent for by expresses from the Prince as soon as he had received the King's message, they all immediately repaired to Kew. When Lord Hervey, who had met some of these people upon the road going to Kew, told His Majesty of it, the King's remark was that he believed they would all soon be tired of the puppy; "for, besides his being a scoundrel, he is such a fool," said the King, "that he will talk more fiddle-faddle nonsense to them in a day than any old woman talks in a week."

On Tuesday, in the evening, Lord Baltimore wrote to Lord Grantham to let him know he had a letter from the Prince to the Queen, and desired to know, since by the King's late orders he was forbid waiting on his Lordship at Hampton Court, how he should get it conveyed to him for his Lordship to deliver to the Queen.

Copy of Lord Baltimore's Letter to Lord Grantham.

LONDON, Sept. 13, 1737.

MY LORD,

I have in my hands a letter from His Royal Highness to the Queen, which I am commanded to give or transmit to your Lordship; and as I am afraid it might be improper for me to wait on you at Hampton Court, I must beg you will be so good as to let me know how and in what manner I may deliver or send it to you. If I may presume to judge of my royal master's sentiments, he does not conceive himself precluded by the King's message from taking this, the only means, of endeavouring as far as he is able to remove His Majesty's displeasure.

I am

Your Lordship's very humble servant,
BALTIMORE.

A great consultation was held whether the Queen should receive or refuse this letter. She was inclined to refuse it, and Sir Robert said he thought it right she should do so, as the making her the mediatrix on this occasion could do her no service, and might furnish matter for drawing her

into difficulties. It was therefore resolved that Lord Grantham should copy the following letter, drawn by Sir Robert Walpole, to Lord Baltimore. 1737

Lord Grantham to Lord Baltimore.

MY LORD,
HAMPTON COURT, Sept. 15, 1737.
I have laid your Lordship's letter before the Queen, who has commanded me to return your Lordship the following answer:
The Queen is very sorry that the Prince's behaviour has given the King such just cause of offence, but thinks herself restrained by the King's last message to the Prince from receiving any application from the Prince on that subject.
I am, my Lord,
Your Lordship's, etc.,
GRANTHAM.

After the copy of this letter was seen and approved, the Queen sent Lord Hervey to Sir Robert Walpole to bid him be sure to send somebody to watch and instruct Lord Grantham whilst he was copying it; to tell him an *o* was to be made like a full moon, a *c* like a half-moon, an *m* with three legs, and an *n* with two, with other writing-master's maxims, or that Grantham's production would never be legible. Lord Hervey said he believed the caution was very necessary, and that as this was the first example, and he believed would be the last, of Grantham's literary correspondence that would ever appear in history and be transmitted to posterity, it would be pity not to have it perfect.

Before this answer was returned, Sir William Irby, Vice-Chamberlain to the Princess, brought Lord Pembroke a letter from Her Royal Highness for the King, which Lord Pembroke gave the King on the 15th of September. The letter had no date, and was in substance as follows:

Copy of the Princess's Letter to the King, delivered by Lord Pembroke, Sept. 15, 1737.
SIRE,

C'est avec tout le respect possible que je prends la liberté de remercier très humblement votre Majesté de l'honneur qu'elle a

1737 bien voulu me faire d'être parrain de ma fille. Je n'aurois pas manqué de venir moi-même vous rendre mes devoirs à Hampton Court pour vous en remercier de bouche; mais, comme j'ai le malheur d'être privée de cet honneur à présent, j'espère que votre Majesté ne trouverez pas mauvais que je prenne la liberté de le faire par écrit. Ma douleur est d'autant plus grande que par la tendresse du Prince je me vois la cause innocente de sa disgrâce; et je me flatte que si j'avois eu la permission de me mettre aux pieds de votre Majesté, j'aurois pu expliquer la démarche du Prince d'une manière à adoucir le ressentiment de votre Majesté. Que je suis à plaindre, Sire, quand une circonstance si flatteuse pour moi, et en même temps si agréable au public, est malheureusement devenue le triste sujet d'une division dans la famille! Je n'importunerai pas davantage votre Majesté que pour vous assurer que, comme je vous dois tout mon bonheur, je me flatte que je vous devrai aussi bientôt le repos de ma vie. Je suis, avec tout le respect imaginable,

Sire, de votre Majesté,

La très-humble et très-obéissante fille,
sujette, et servante,

AUGUSTE.

In this letter not the least mention being made of thanks to the Queen for having stood godmother, nor any acknowledgments to the King for his goodness in leaving the child, the King was very far from taking it as an indication of the Prince being at all humbled by his exile, and I believe the omission of any acknowledgments to the Queen did not make it likely to have any omissions to the King overlooked. The mentioning the birth of this little brat, too, as an incident so grateful to the public, was another air of grandeur in the Prince's letter that did not contribute greatly towards its meeting with a very kind reception. The Queen sent Lord Hervey to Sir Robert Walpole (to whom the King had given the Princess's letter to consider what answer he should make) to desire Sir Robert would not forget some slaps for all these impertinences; but Sir Robert told Lord Hervey he would only do it in general, without particularising, that the King might not, after he had got rid of his son, be drawn into a paper-war with his daughter-in-law, which was the point he chiefly

endeavoured to avoid. The draft of the King's letter to 1737 the Princess, which was afterward to be put into French, was as follows:

The King to the Princess at Kew, from Hampton Court, Sept. 18, 1737, sent by Lord Pembroke to Sir William Irby.

MADAM,

I am sorry that anything should happen to give you the least uneasiness. It is a misfortune to you, but not owing to me, that you are involved in the consequences of your husband's unpardonable conduct. I pity you to see you first exposed to the utmost danger in the execution of his designs, and then made the plea for a series of repeated indignities offered to me. I wish some insinuations in your letter had been omitted, which, however, I do not impute to you, for

I am, etc.

Translation.

Je suis fâché, Madame, qu'il soit arrivé aucune chose à vous donner la moindre inquiétude. C'est un malheur pour vous, mais qui ne vient pas de moi, que vous êtes impliqué dans les conséquences de la conduite inexcusable de votre mari. Je vous plains d'avoir été premièrement exposée aux plus grands dangers en exécution de ses desseins, et puis d'avoir servi de prétexte pour une suite d'indignités réitérées qui m'ont été faites. Je souhaiterois que quelques insinuations dans votre lettre eussent été omises, lesquelles, cependant, je ne vous impute pas, étant convaincu qu'elles ne viennent pas de vous.

G. R.

This letter Sir Robert Walpole had ended in this manner: "There are some things in your letter I wish had been omitted, which I resent in him, but do not impute to you." The words "which I resent in him" Lord Hervey desired might be left out, saying they would certainly draw on an answer from the Princess to say how sorry she was to have heightened a resentment she had endeavoured to appease; and that, considering the letter was to a lady, it was better to insinuate what those words imported than to express it so squabbly; and that the meaning, though

1737 not the expression, would be full as strong without them.

In the conversation on the copy of this letter, Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey that the King and Queen were again relapsed into their justification of Lord Carteret, and complained of the Queen's injustice in defending the conduct of a man who was at this time generalissimo of her son's army, and ordering all the batteries to be levelled at her. "Sir Luke Schaub," added he, "my Lord, every Saturday brings messages to her from my Lord Carteret, by which she is weak enough to be imposed upon, and at the same time weak enough to repeat. She told me that Lord Carteret said he used to think her a wise woman, but her infatuation in risking everything and making the whole world her enemy for the sake of one man was such an infatuation that it was impossible to reconcile it to good sense. Upon which, my Lord, I asked her: 'Madam, is this a quarrel of mine? Was it begun on my account? Was it fomented by me? Was it instigated, widened, or kept up by me? Are you exposed upon my account? Or am I, after a great deal of good fortune (for I am not vain enough to impute my success in your service to skill), am I, after having the good luck whilst I have had the honour to preside in your councils to ward off foreign dangers, and carry you through domestic difficulties, at last brought to have my fate depend on no dispute of my own, on what you know I foresaw, what I advised you to avoid, and what if you will now vest me with power I will get the better of? Your heart, Madam, is set upon getting the better of your son. Will it be getting the better of him to discard your Minister and take his? What one vote can my Lord Carteret make in parliament by his personal interest? Is your son to be bought? If you will buy him, I will get him cheaper than Carteret; and yet, after all I have said, if Your Majesty thinks he can serve you better than me in this contest with the Prince, I own it is of such consequence to you to con-

quer in this strife, that I advise you to discard me and take 1737
Carteret to-morrow.' " "And what answer, Sir," said Lord
Hervey, "did you receive to all this?" "Oh, my Lord,"
replied Sir Robert, "as usual; a flood of grace, good words,
favour, and professions; saying she only related these
things as stories that were going about the world, and not
as things that had made any impression upon her."

Sir Robert then began upon a subject he often launched
into, which was with how much facility anybody who got
about the Queen could give her ill impressions of people,
and how indelible those impressions were when once they
were made. "For example," says he, "my Lord, it is pro-
digious with what acrimony she has spoken of Lord Pem-
broke and the Duke of Richmond on this occasion, only
for showing a desire for reconciliation." "You have saved
the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Chancellor then, Sir?"
replied Lord Hervey. "You would not, I find," said Sir
Robert. "Not alone," answered Lord Hervey; "but if the
present fate of two of the four had been to be changed by
me, I assure you, Sir, it would not have been theirs, nor
have I, upon my word, to the Queen ever tried to heighten
their demerit on that score."

Lord Hervey found by this conversation that Sir Robert
Walpole had forgotten he had told him he did not
design to report to the Queen what had passed in council;
but Lord Hervey gave his memory no assistance now, any
more than he had before given his design credit.

As to what Sir Robert said afterwards of having per-
suaded the Queen to be blind to this conduct in the Duke
of Richmond and Lord Pembroke, Lord Hervey believed
it; because he knew the Queen had adopted Sir Robert's
expressions to him about an hour before, when she said to
him: "People who keep hounds must not hang every one
that runs a little slower than the rest, provided in the main
they will go with the pack; one must not expect them all
to run just alike and to be equally good." And when Lord
Hervey told Sir Robert this, and that he knew his style,

1737 and where she had learned this figure, Sir Robert said he was always glad when he heard she repeated as her own any notion he had endeavoured to infuse, because it was a sign what he had laboured had taken place.

But Lord Hervey did not tell Sir Robert how unmercifully at the same time the Queen had abused both these great Lords. Lord Pembroke (she said) was the best creature in the world, and meant very well; but, with all his good meaning, if one desired him to shave anybody, he was capable of cutting off their chin or their cheek, and falling a-crying afterwards and saying he took it for their beard. "Poor man! he wishes very well, but he is as odd as his father was, not so tractable, and full as mad. And for your friend the Duke of Richmond," said she, "my good Lord Hervey, he is so half-witted, so bizarre, and so grandseigneur, and so mulish, that he is as troublesome from meaning well and comprehending so ill, as if he meant as ill as he comprehends. But, in short, there they are, and one must do as if one did not see what they are, but commend their good intentions, make them go on, and in the civilest way in the world never do what they would have one, and in the softest way in the world never let them do what they have a mind to."

This morning, too, the Queen had told Lord Hervey that she heard the Prince threatened furiously what he would do with all his family except the Duke if he came to be King. "For the Duke," said she, "I hear he always speaks of him with great affectation of kindness; but for me I am to be fleeced, and flayed, and minced; for Emily, she is to be shut up between four walls; and for Caroline, she is to be sent to starve. For the others, he does not deign to know that they exist; but I would be glad to know what hurt he can do any of them; and for good, I do not desire or expect he should do them any; nor, whilst I live, shall they want him, or trouble him."

This morning when Sir Robert Walpole had told Lord Hervey how perpetually he was inculcating to the King

and Queen the necessity and expediency of being blind 1737
to the failings of people who were good in the main, and
whom, for that reason, they intended to continue in their
service, Lord Hervey agreed with him that this was a
very good maxim for Princes, but one which he thought
Sir Robert had pushed sometimes too far as a Minister.
"For though Princes," said he, "always have it in their
power to part with such servants, yet Ministers may not
always have it in their power to part with such associates,
who find they can with impunity grapple for power with
those who are their superiors in power." Sir Robert said
he understood Lord Hervey. "But since I resolve," con-
tinued he, "to go on with the Duke of Newcastle and the
Lord Chancellor, to what purpose, my dear Lord, should
I sour them by letting them know I saw last winter what
they were nibbling at?" "That they may not," replied
Lord Hervey, "believe one of these two things—that they
are either dexterous enough to blind you, or that they are
too considerable for you to dare to sour them." "In short,"
said Sir Robert, "I resolve to go on with them, and I have
in all my experience never known *éclaircissements* make
people more one's friends, and have often known them
make men more one's enemies."

However, as cautious as Sir Robert Walpole designed
to be, or affected to be, upon this occasion, he gave some
proofs, under his hand too, and very strong ones, of his being
thoroughly dissatisfied with the Duke of Newcastle's con-
duct towards him, of which I could cite many instances,
but will relate only one of the strongest. Whenever the
King was to acknowledge Don Carlos King of Naples in
form, it would be necessary to send somebody from this
Court in form to His Neapolitan Majesty with a compli-
ment; and for this embassy Sir Robert pitched on one Mr.
Williams,¹ a young man with a great estate, who had ever
since he was in Parliament voted with the Court, and,
contrary to most people who did so, had never received

¹Afterwards Sir Charles Hanbury Williams.

1737 any favour or employment from the Court. Sir Robert had told Mr. Williams, too, that he should have £4,000 to pay the expenses of his journey; and at the same time bid him go to the Duke of Newcastle, in whose province, as Secretary of State, Naples was, to ask his recommendation to the King, which Williams did, and was refused it, the Duke of Newcastle telling him that he was already engaged to another; and in order to have that other succeed, the Duke of Newcastle went immediately to the King, and told him that Mr. Fane, His Majesty's Minister at Florence, whom he would recommend to him for this embassy, would cost His Majesty but £500; whereas, if the King should send anybody from hence, it would cost him £5,000. The difference between £500 and £5,000 was sufficient to turn the balance in favour of any person or any solicitation thrown into the scale of the former; and Sir Robert Walpole, upon hearing what the Duke of Newcastle had done, wrote to Mr. Williams, telling him how ashamed he was of not being able to keep his word with him, told him the whole transaction, and said the Duke of Newcastle had within this twelvemonth played him several of these rascally tricks, and thwarted him in many things in order to make difficulties in his administration of the King's affairs, which he ought rather to help him in removing. The next time Sir Robert saw Mr. Williams he repeated all this to him by word of mouth, adding a great many other accusations of the Duke of Newcastle's conduct, and showing not a little acrimony against him for several things his Grace had done. Sir Robert told Mr. Williams, too, that the Duke of Newcastle was making great court to my Lord Chancellor, and that he proposed by that means to work himself into more power at present, and to be able to form a ministry of his own with my Lord Chancellor, in case any accident happened to Sir Robert.

All that I have here related was told by Mr. Williams to Lord Hinton, and by Lord Hinton to me; and Sir Robert, though he did not care to turn the Duke of New-

castle out, contrived matters so that both the King and 1737
Queen spoke of him in a manner that plainly showed, as
little as princes generally think like their subjects, yet with
regard to the Duke of Newcastle even the public, that
seldom makes false judgments, paid no more deference to
the Duke of Newcastle's character at present than Their
Majesties. The Duke of Newcastle still kept well with the
Princess Emily, whom he had begged for God's sake,
just before the King's last message to the Prince, if she
had any interest with her mother, that she would use it to
prevent that message going, and to persuade the Queen to
make things up with the Prince before this affair was pushed
to an extremity that might make the wound incurable,
which petition to the Queen did the Duke of Newcastle more
hurt with her, though it came through the hand of a friend,
than all the stories his enemies could tell put together.

On Sunday the 18th of September, in the morning, just
after Lord Hervey was gone from the King and Queen,
and before they went to church, there came another letter
by Sir William Irby from the Princess to the Queen,
which was given by him to Lord Grantham, and by Lord
Grantham to the Queen. These were the contents of it.

The Princess to the Queen.

Kew, le 17^{me} Sept., 1737.

MADAME,

Je prends la liberté de remercier très-humblement votre
Majesté de l'honneur qu'elle m'a fait deux fois de me venir voir,
et aussi d'avoir bien voulu être marraine de ma fille. Je suis très-
mortifiée de ne pouvoir le faire en personne, comme j'aurois cer-
tainement fait si par les ordres du Roi il ne m'eût été défendu. Je
suis très-affligée de la manière dont la conduite du Prince a été repré-
sentée à vos Majestés, et surtout dans l'article des deux voyages que
nous fîmes de Hampton Court à Londres la semaine avant mes
couches. J'ose assurer votre Majesté que les médecins et la sage-
femme furent alors d'opinion que je n'accoucherai pas avant le mois
de Septembre, et que le mal dont je me plaignois étoit seulement la
colique; et en effet, Madame, est-il croyable que si j'étois allée deux
fois à Londres, dans le dessein et l'attente d'accoucher, je serois

1737 retournée à Hampton Court? Je me flatte que le temps et les bons offices de votre Majesté apporteront un heureux changement à une situation d'affaires d'autant plus douloureux pour moi que j'en suis la cause innocente. Je suis, avec tout le respect imaginable,

Madame,

Votre très-humble et très-obéissante
fille et servante,

AUGUSTE.

The Queen sent the letter immediately to Sir Robert Walpole, who was just come to Hampton Court from his bower of bliss at Richmond Park; and as soon as Sir Robert came into the closet at chapel, the Queen asked him what he thought of this last performance. He said he looked upon it, put into plain English, to be nothing more or less than saying, "You lie, you lie, you lie," from one end to the other. The Queen agreed with him that it would admit of no other construction, and desired him to take the letter with him to Richmond Park (where he was to return as soon as he had dined), and there consider of an answer against the next morning.

The King and Queen were both of them more angry at this letter than at any they had yet received. Sir Robert Walpole showed Lord Hervey the letter behind the King and Queen's chairs whilst they were at dinner, but that place was too public for them to talk of it.

The next morning at breakfast the Queen talked of nothing else, and with more warmth than she had ever done of anything that had yet passed. Lord Hervey said it was certainly a most abominable piece of impudence; but that it would be just as reasonable to be angry with the paper it was writ upon, or the pen that wrote it, as with the poor Princess, which made it a little difficult to answer, since the answer must be directed to her. The Queen said it was impossible to have the lie given one without returning it, let it come from what hand it would, to which Lord Hervey agreed; but said he considered the Princess only as the involuntary vehicle, and would con-

sequently write as civilly to her as if she was out of the 1737
question. "And of all things, Madam," continued Lord
Hervey, "I would advise Your Majesty to avoid being so
particular in your answer as to draw on expostulations and
replies. In the first place, it would be furnishing the Prince
with means to evade the King's order in one of the most
essential parts, and to evade it too in the most advan-
tageous way for himself; for if after the King in his mes-
sage has said in this situation he will receive no reply,
and the Prince, by changing the names of the corre-
spondents, and transferring this literary commerce from
himself and the King to the Princess and Your Majesty,
can contrive, notwithstanding this prohibition, still to
keep up the correspondence, he not only has outwitted
you by forcing you to correspond with him whether you
will or no, but does it in a way that makes even the pro-
hibition of use to him; for as all his rage is levelled against
Your Majesty, he has by these means opportunities of
saying things to you by his wife which he would not dare
to say to the King from himself. And why should Your
Majesty desire to keep up a correspondence by which you
can be no gainer in any light, and by which you may expose
yourself a thousand ways, in writing something or other
they may take hold of? You are sure they will never own
again so much as they have owned already, for which rea-
son you can get nothing from them, and they may get
something from you; therefore I think it is better to cut
this matter short. In the next place, if you speak in soft
and palliating terms of the Prince's conduct, they will say
you retract, and dare not stand to what you have said; and
if you urge with any strength the facts against him in
retorting this lie that you find so hard to digest, and
paint this *canaille* of a prince, as you are pleased to call
him, in his true colours, people will certainly lay hold of
that to blame you, and say you were not satisfied with
turning him out of the house and blowing up his father
against him, but that you also endeavoured to set his wife

1737 against him too, and to make him uneasy there, by telling her she was married to a knave, a fool, and a liar."

"What sort of answer, then," said the Queen, "would you have me write?"

"If I were to advise," replied Lord Hervey, "I would have Your Majesty, with great ease and coolness, tell her you are glad to hear she is so well after her lying-in; call her *ma chère* Princesse; and tell her that, as she is a *bonne bête*, you are not at all angry with her, and would be glad to do anything to serve or please her; that you wish, for both your sakes, her husband was *moins sot* and better advised; and as to the representation of the two London journeys, I would tell her in a graver style, without entering into particulars, that when she comes to be truly informed to whom and by whom those representations were made, she will not complain of the partiality of them. After this I would throw out a small hint of its neither being proper nor useful, in Your Majesty's situation and hers, to carry on this correspondence; and enter into no expostulations on the Prince's conduct, and then give her *le bon jour*."

The Queen made Lord Hervey repeat several times the substance of this letter; and when Sir Robert Walpole came afterwards with the copy of a letter he had drawn in English, in a very formal style, and entering minutely into all the particulars of the Prince's conversation (the morning after the Princess was brought to bed) with the Queen, his sisters, Sir Robert Walpole, and Lord Harrington, the Queen made Lord Hervey's proposal her own, said she would write in a more easy style, and not descend into any particulars for fear of continuing a correspondence which she could get nothing by, and to which she was determined to put an end.

Accordingly in the afternoon, after telling Sir Robert Walpole she would collect, from what they had said and he had written, the substance of a French letter, the Queen wrote and sent the following letter to the Princess:

HAMPTON COURT, le 20me Sept.

Je suis ravie, ma chère Princesse, de vous scavoir parfaitement remise après vos couches. Vous pouvez être assurée, comme vous n'avez jamais offensé ni le Roi ni moi, je ne manquerai jamais de vous donner des marques de mon égard et de mon affection. Je crois qu'il nous seroit mal-séant à toutes les deux que j'entrasse en discussion avec vous sur les malheureux différends entre le Roi et mon fils: quand vous serez informée au juste des différentes déclarations qui ont été faites au sujet de vos voyages de Hampton Court, et par qui et à qui, vous serez convaincue que la conduite de votre mari n'a été nullement mise dans un faux jour. J'espère que le temps et une mûre considération portera mon fils à de justes sentimens de son devoir envers son père; c'est là le seul moyen de procurer cet heureux changement, lequel vous ne scauriez souhaiter plus sincèrement que je le fais.

CAROLINE.

When the Prince showed Lord Baltimore the copy of the Princess's letter to the Queen (to which this was the answer) the Prince asked him how he liked it; to which Lord Baltimore answered he could neither approve nor disapprove, without being master of the facts, and asked the Prince to whom he had ever spoken of those two journeys to London; to which the Prince said, "To nobody whatever." Then Lord Baltimore desired the Prince to recollect; but the Prince persisted that he was very sure he had spoken of them to nobody belonging to the King's court. All this Lord Baltimore told Lord Harrington, upon Lord Harrington's telling him what had passed between him, Sir Robert Walpole, and the Prince, and between the Queen and the Prince, immediately after the Princess's delivery. Lord Baltimore said he did not believe there was one body of the Prince's council, nor three in his family, that so much as knew the Prince had ever seen Lord Harrington and Sir Robert Walpole that morning in St. James's.

Lord Jersey told Sir Robert Walpole the same thing that Lord Baltimore had told Lord Harrington; and when Sir Robert Walpole said this was a most surprising piece

1737 of folly as well as impudence in the Prince, the King and Queen both told him they who knew him were not at all surprised at it, and that if there was anything he could be guilty of that was more impudent and more foolish, Sir Robert might depend on his committing it the first opportunity; and the Queen added: "I must do Lord Hervey the justice to say that when I told him I did not believe anybody had advised Fretz to write these letters, Lord Hervey answered he believed nobody could have been fool enough to advise him to write them had they known all previous circumstances; but that he was sure Fretz had never owned to anybody the folly he had been guilty of in those two conversations that first night with me, and with Lord Harrington and you."

Whilst the Prince was at Kew, he and Lady Archibald Hamilton, and Dunoyer the dancing-master, and the Princess, used to walk three or four hours every day in the lanes and fields about Richmond. The young Princess falling ill there, the Prince sent to the King and Queen to beg they would give leave to Yager, their German house-apothecary at Hampton Court, to come and see her, which accordingly they did; Sir Robert Walpole having "very politely" (as the Queen told me) come and tapped her on the shoulder whilst she was at chapel, to deliver this message from the Prince, and ask her permission and the King's to send Yager immediately.

The Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London having sent, soon after the Princess was brought to bed, to know when His Royal Highness would give them leave to wait on him with their congratulations, the Prince sent them word he would let them know as soon as the Princess was well enough to see them with him; and in consequence of that message he and the Princess went from Kew to Carlton House (so his house in Pall Mall was called) to receive them.

Lord Carteret, Lord Chesterfield, the Duke of Marlborough, and others of the Prince's present Council,

stood close by His Royal Highness at this audience, and distributed to everybody there printed copies of the King's last message to turn the Prince out of St. James's, commenting very pathetically on the cruel usage His Royal Highness had received from his father, Lord Carteret adding at the same time: "You see, gentlemen, how the Prince is threatened if he does not dismiss us; but we are here still, for all that. He is a rock; you may depend upon him, gentlemen; he is sincere; he is firm." The Prince made them a long speech in great form, in which he made many professions of his regard to the trade and prosperity of the City of London; telling them he knew their importance in this kingdom, and the value of their friendship, and should never look upon them as beggars, alluding in this expression to a report which had been industriously spread of Sir Robert Walpole's having called the citizens the excise year a parcel of sturdy beggars. 1737

When Sir Robert Walpole reported all this to the King and Queen, he told them Carteret had got the message printed for this occasion; but Sir Robert Walpole having told Lord Hervey, above a week before, that he designed to let this message slip into print as by accident, I am apt to imagine he put that upon Lord Carteret which was entirely his own doing. When he came out of the King's closet from making this report, he told Lord Godolphin, Lord Hervey, and Mr. Pelham, what he had been saying to the King; and when he came to that part of the relation that mentions Lord Carteret's having said, "The Prince is firm—he is a rock," Sir Robert said: "The Prince can never be more firm in maintaining Carteret than I am in my resolution never to have anything to do with him. I am a rock. I am determined in no shape will I ever act with that man."¹

The Prince took the Duke of Norfolk's house in St. James's Square for his town dwelling, and Cliveden for

¹Here the Windsor copy has a note by General Hervey: "This chasm from p. 98 to p. 104 [of the copy] is among the original papers as I received them."

1737 his country habitation, having given unregarded hints to the Duke of Bedford of his desiring to have Southampton House; but before the Duke of Norfolk would consent to the Prince having his house, the Duchess of Norfolk came to Hampton Court to ask the Queen, whom she saw in private, if it would be disagreeable to her and the King; and the Queen assuring the Duchess of Norfolk it would not, and thanking her for the civility she had shown to the King and her, the Duke of Norfolk let the Prince know his house was at His Royal Highness's service.

The Prince reduced the number of his inferior servants, which made him many enemies among the lower sort of people, and did not save him much money. He put off all his horses too that were not absolutely necessary; and farmed all his tables, even that of the Princess and himself.

I have already taken notice¹ that nobody was ordered by the King to quit the Prince's service, and that particular leave was given to every one who had employments at both Courts to go to both; yet many people quitted the Prince's service, nobody the King's: some through fear of disobliging the King, if they made use of the permission they had to remain, and others from being so ill-used by the Prince, who wanted to pique them into quitting, that there was no possibility of their staying there. Lady Irwin was not in the last class; for though she was as ill-used as anybody, she determined to stand it all, and remained Lady of the Bedchamber to the Princess. Lady Torrington and Lady Effingham laid down that office; the first because her husband, partly from jealousy and partly from policy (both ill-founded), obliged her to it; and the latter only because the other had set her the example. Jemmy Pelham, Secretary to the Prince, was one of those the Prince teased into quitting, and Mr. Lyttelton was immediately put into his place. Mr. Cornwallis, Equerry

¹Presumably in the chasm noted on p. 837.

to the Prince, and a Member of Parliament, quitted because the pension he had from the King was more than the salary from his place, and he feared if he continued in the one, the other would be stopped. 1737

The Prince went from Kew to the play at London, and was not only clapped at his coming into the house, which was the absurd compliment usually paid to any of the royal family on those occasions, but was also huzzaed; and in that part of the play (which was *Cato*) where Cato says these words—"When vice prevails, and impious men bear sway, the post of honour is a private station"—there was another loud huzza, with a great clap, in the latter part of which applause the Prince himself joined in the face of the whole audience.

When the King and Queen were told of this by Sir Robert Walpole, they expressed great resentment, and seemed to wish as well as expect that His Royal Highness would push this affectation of popularity and violence against his father at last to treason, though the turn the Prince himself took, as well as all his people, was to excuse and speak well of the King, to lay every wrong upon the Queen, and declare Sir Robert Walpole the chief object of their resentment; though nobody ever taking Sir Robert Walpole for a fool, and he having no possible interest in dividing the Whigs or the royal family, or in officiously irritating the successor to the Crown, nobody who gave themselves time to reflect, or was capable of judging when they did reflect, ever could bring themselves to believe Sir Robert Walpole would endeavour to raise the King or Queen's resentment, how necessary soever he might find it to gratify and serve that resentment when it was raised.

The Queen told Lord Hervey that the three things of which the Prince accused the King, besides the robbing him of the £100,000 a year, were His Majesty's having thrice cheated him, by his sinking the late King's will, and the Duke of York's will, and by seizing the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall; and as to the two first articles,

1737 she said the Prince was not named in either of the wills, and that the Duke of York (who died the year after the present King came to the throne) in his will had left everything he had, which came to about £50,000, to his present Majesty, except his jewels, and his jewels he left to the Queen of Prussia, to whom the King had delivered them, after satisfying the King of Prussia (who before the King showed him the will had a mind to litigate it in favour of his wife) that the will would admit of no dispute; and as to the King's seizing the revenues of Cornwall, all he had done was to take care, on the receiver of the revenues for the Duchy of Cornwall having embezzled some of the money, that, as His Majesty's arrears was the debt first incurred, that debt should be first paid.

Whilst the Queen was telling this one morning to Lord Hervey, the King opened the door at the further end of her gallery, upon which the Queen chid Lord Hervey for coming so late, saying she had several things to say to him, and that he was always so long in coming after he was sent for, that she never had any time to talk with him; to which Lord Hervey replied, it was not his fault, for that he always came the moment he was called; that he wished with all his heart the King had more love, or Lady Deloraine more wit, that he might have more time with Her Majesty, but that he thought it very hard that he should be snubbed and reprov'd because the King was old and Lady Deloraine a fool. This made the Queen laugh, and the King asking when he came up to her what it was at, she said it was at a conversation Lord Hervey was reporting between the Prince and Mr. Lyttelton on his being made Secretary, and left Lord Hervey, on the King's desiring him to repeat it, to invent one; telling Lord Hervey the next time she saw him: "I think I was even with you for your impertinence." To which Lord Hervey replied: "The next time you serve me so, Madam, perhaps I may be even with you, and desire Your Majesty to repeat as well as report."

Soon after the message got into print, some of the Prince's letters were likewise printed. Those that had the greatest air of submission were picked out on this occasion in order to move the compassion of the public, and being published in English, the Prince's party, who published them, took the liberty, under the pretence of a translation, to deviate a little from the original, and give them yet a stronger air of submission than they had in the French. In one very material part, too, they absolutely falsified the original; for whereas the Prince, in the original of the first letter he wrote to the King after the first message by Lord Essex, says: "He should have come the Monday before to Hampton Court to throw himself at the King's feet at his levee if the Queen had not ordered him to defer it till Wednesday," in the translation the words "to defer it till Wednesday" were left out, and the sentence running thus: "That he should have thrown himself at the King's feet on Monday at the levee if the Queen had not forbid him," it had an appearance to all the world, and was so descanted upon by the Prince's emissaries, that the Queen had taken upon her the very night she went to London to the Princess's labour to forbid the Prince the King's presence.

This and other circumstances made the King and Queen determine to have all the original letters and messages printed that had passed since the first night, and verbal translations of the letters together with the originals. Lord Hervey the Queen desired might translate them; and when Sir Robert Walpole brought Her Majesty's commands to him, he made him the compliment of beginning his speech by that passage in Horace to Mæcenas, "*Docte sermones utriusque linguæ.*" Lord Hervey lost no time but translated them all by the next morning; and telling Sir Robert Walpole that it would be to no purpose to print the letters if the Prince's declaration to him and Lord Harrington was not printed with them, to show what contradictory stories the Prince had told on this occasion, Sir

1737 Robert said he was in the right, and Lord Hervey had the satisfaction of being employed to give the Prince the lie in print, by the authority of the Government; and because the stronger the lie was given, the better he liked his commission, he advised Sir Robert Walpole to get the Queen's consent to put a *N.B.* at the end of the declaration made to him and Lord Harrington, to certify to the public that the same declaration had been made the same morning by the Prince to the Queen and the two eldest Princesses, which he told Sir Robert would be absolutely necessary to prevent the world saying the Queen had retracted, and made Lord Harrington and Sir Robert own her lie; and at the same time would show that what was done, was done by her authority, and make it more impossible for the Prince to deny what he had said. This proposal, therefore, Sir Robert relished extremely, and got the Queen's consent for the *N.B.*, which accordingly was inserted; Lord Hervey, for fear of accidents, and being afterwards disavowed in it, or accused for wording it too strong, getting Sir Robert in his own handwriting to give him the words in which this *N.B.* was to be expressed, which he kept by him.

The Duke of Newcastle sat in consultation with Sir Robert Walpole and Lord Hervey, when Lord Hervey was to receive his ultimate directions the night before he was to deliver these papers to the printer, the correction of the press being left to his care, and the two points on which his Grace solely descanted were these. First, the settling and giving many excellent reasons to support his opinion how the original or translation should be placed in the paper on the right side or the left; for the paper being to be printed in two columns on each side of each leaf, the originals and translations were to be placed by the side of one another. His Grace's next difficulty, which he said was really an insurmountable one, was, that by the *N.B.* having a reference to the declaration made by the Prince to Lord Harrington and Sir Robert Walpole, it

could only be put at the bottom of it, which, his Grace very 1737 judiciously observed, would be highly improper. "For between two declarations, one made to the Queen and the other only to two subjects, how very disrespectful," said his Grace, "will it be to the Queen to give the precedence to the declaration that was only made to two subjects before that made to her, and yet how is it possible to avoid it."

This egregious folly and formal absurdity in a man that had been fifteen years Secretary of State is so incredible that I do not flatter myself that it will not be much more natural to conclude I am a great liar than that he could be so great an idiot. The Queen and the Princess Caroline, to whom I related this little anecdote, would not, till the Queen asked Sir Robert Walpole about it, believe it was literal.

The King and Queen were full as well pleased with giving Lord Hervey this commission to call their son a liar in print as he was to receive it, and charged him not to embellish the fool's letters in the translation, or to mend the spelling in the original. Lord Hervey took occasion upon this subject, among many other things, to say he did not believe there ever was a father and a son so thoroughly unlike in every particular as the King and the Prince, and enumerated several points in which they differed, as little to the advantage of the Prince as to the dispraise or displeasure of the King. The King said he had really thought so himself a thousand times, and had often asked the Queen if the beast was his son. Lord Hervey said that question must be to very little purpose, for to be sure the Queen would never own it if he was not. The King said the first child generally was the husband's, "and therefore," says he, "I fancy he is what in German we call a Wechselbalg. I do not know," continued he, "if you have a word for it in English: it is not what you call a foundling, but a child put in a cradle instead of another." "That is a changeling," replied Lord Hervey. The King was ex-

1737 tremely pleased with this translation, and said: "I wish you could prove him a changeling in the German sense of the word as easily as anybody can prove him so in the other; though the Queen was a great while before her maternal affection would give him up for a fool, and yet I told her before he had been here a week he had not common sense."

Lord Hervey said the Queen had often last year done the honours of His Royal Highness's understanding to him, and was very loth to give it quite up, but that of late he had not perceived she had any hope left of disguising it. "My dear Lord, I will give it you under my hand," replied the Queen, "if you are in any fear of my relapsing, that my dear first-born is the greatest ass, and the greatest liar, and the greatest *canaille*, and the greatest beast, in the whole world, and that I most heartily wish he was out of it."

The letters, though translated and ready for the press, were not yet printed, and I suspect the reason of this delay to have been Sir Robert Walpole's having no mind to give the Prince the lie in print, and yet not knowing how to avoid, in case the letters were published, the publishing also the declaration made to him and Lord Harrington. It was said by many and thought by some that Lord Harrington had some scruples of this kind, but I know those reports were ill-founded. The Queen thought the delay proceeded from Lord Hervey's not having finished the translations, and one Sunday morning that he came back from London, where he had been for two days, she accosted him, half in jest and half in earnest, in this manner: "Where the devil are you, and what have you been doing? You are a pretty man to have the justification of your friends committed to your hands. There are the letters which you have had this week to translate, and they are not yet ready to be dispersed, and only because you must go to London to divert yourself in a bawdy house or with some of your nasty guenipes, instead of doing what you

have undertaken." Lord Hervey made the Queen no other answer than repeating some sentences out of Shakespeare, which he tacked together thus: "Go tell your slaves how cholerick you are, and make your bondmen tremble. Your anger passes by me like the idle wind, which I regard not." The Queen laughed and said: "You are so impatient and so saucy, there is no living with you; but what do you say for yourself?" "I say," replied Lord Hervey, "that they have been out of my hands these six days, and were finished by me in twelve hours." "Then I shall fall upon Sir Robert," replied the Queen. But she did not scold him so much, though she was less satisfied with his conduct in this affair, guessing a little, I believe, that he had a mind to shuffle off the publication of them. At last all these messages and original letters that passed between the King, Queen, Prince, and Princesses, with the translations, were printed, and many copies of them dispersed over the whole kingdom at the expense of the King. What people will say of them I do not yet know, for though they are already printed they are not, whilst I am now writing, yet circulated.

The Queen told me at this time she heard the Prince's people intended to print the letters the present King, when he was Prince of Wales, wrote to the late King upon the quarrel in the late reign, and said she concluded, if they did, Lord Chesterfield must have got the copies of them from the Duchess of Kendal; for, as to the originals, all the letters the present King had written to the late King had been found among the late King's papers when he died, and the present King had made her burn all of them except three.

However, soon after printed they were, together with the late King's message to the Prince to turn him out of St. James's, and a sort of circular letter by Mr. Addison, then Secretary of State, by the late King's orders, to all the English Ministers in foreign Courts to give an account of the whole transaction; and, as I imagine a short

1737 narrative of so material and interesting an occurrence cannot be unentertaining, I shall here insert it.

Message in writing from the late King to the Prince of Wales, by his Vice-Chamberlain, Mr. Coke, December 2, 1717.

The Vice-Chamberlain is ordered to go to my son and to tell him from me that he and his domestics must leave my house. He is likewise commanded to go to the Princess to tell her from me that, notwithstanding the order sent to my son, she may remain at St. James's until her health will suffer her to follow her husband. He is, moreover, commanded to tell the Princess from me that it is my pleasure that my grandson and grand-daughters remain at St. James's where they are, and that the Princess is permitted to come to see them when she has a mind, and that the children are permitted from time to time to go and see her and my son. The Vice-Chamberlain must further tell the Princess that, in the present situation of my family, I think that whilst she stays at St. James's she would do well to see no company.

Copy of the Circular Letter from Mr. Addison, Secretary of State, to the English Ministers in Foreign Courts.

SIR,

His Majesty having been informed that many reports are spread, for the most part ill grounded, relating to what has passed in the royal family, has ordered me to send you the inclosed account thereof.

I am, with a great deal of respect, Sir,

Your most obedient and most humble servant,

JO. ADDISON.

LONDON, December 3, 1717.

As soon as the young Prince was born the King informed himself what was the custom in the like case in the kingdom with regard to the ceremony of baptism, and having found by the registers that when it was a boy and that the King was godfather, it was usual for him to name for second godfather one of the chief Lords of the Court, and oftenest the Lord Chamberlain, he named for that office the Duke of Newcastle, who is possessed of that employment, at the same time naming the godmother, the Duchess of St. Alban's, Groom of the Stole to the Princess. Nevertheless, His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales was so chagrined at it that, Thursday last,

after the solemnity of the baptism was over, being no longer able to master his resentments, he came up to the Duke of Newcastle, and gave him very injurious language, supposing that he had made interest for that honour contrary to His Royal Highness's inclinations. The King was then in the chamber, but not near enough to hear what the Prince said to the Duke. The latter thinking himself obliged to inform the King of it, and the Prince having owned the facts to the Dukes of Kingston, Kent, and Roxburgh, whom His Majesty sent that morning on that occasion, His Majesty ordered him by a second message not to go out of his apartment till further orders. On Saturday the Prince wrote a letter to the King, and on Sunday morning wrote another; but His Majesty not having found them satisfactory, and having besides many reasons to be discontented with the Prince's conduct in several other particulars, signified to him yesterday afternoon by his Vice-Chamberlain, Mr. Coke, that he must go out of the palace of St. James's, and to the Princess that she might stay as long as she thought proper. But as to the Princesses his grand-daughters, and the young Prince, it was the King's will that they should stay near him in the palace, and that the Princess should be permitted to see them as often as she desired. Nevertheless, the Princess being unwilling to quit the Prince her husband, retired with him to Lord Grantham's, her Great Chamberlain, in whose house their Royal Highnesses lay last night. 1737

The Prince of Wales to the King.

SIR,

I received with all submission Your Majesty's commands, confining me to my own apartment till Your Majesty should signify your further pleasure to me. So great a mark of Your Majesty's displeasure surprised me extremely, never having entertained a thought of Your Majesty unbecoming a dutiful son. I was made to believe Your Majesty appeared easy in the choice I had made of the Duke of York to be godfather to my son, and that the Duke of Newcastle might represent him, and not be godfather himself. Being persuaded of this I could not but look upon it as an unaccountable hardship that he would be godfather in spite of me; but when Your Majesty thought proper to command it I submitted. This treatment of the Duke of Newcastle touched me sensibly, and so far raised my indignation that, at the sight of him upon this occasion, I could not help showing it. But as the respect I have always had for Your Majesty hindered me from expressing my resentments against him, whilst

1737 he was charged with Your Majesty's orders, I hope Your Majesty will have the goodness not to look upon what I said to the Duke privately as want of respect to Your Majesty, which was contrary to my intentions. I ask your pardon, and beg Your Majesty would be persuaded that I am, with the greatest respect, etc.,

The Prince of Wales to the King.

SIR,

I hope Your Majesty will have the goodness to excuse me if, in the condition I was in yesterday, when I took the liberty to write to Your Majesty, I omitted to mention that I will show no resentment to the Duke of Newcastle upon what has passed, and I take this opportunity to assure Your Majesty of it, being, with profound respect,

Sir, etc.

The Prince of Wales to the King.

SIR,

I have just now obeyed Your Majesty's orders, having left St. James's. The Princess goes along with me, and our servants shall follow with all imaginable expedition.

It was believed that the Prince's people at this time got the papers printed which I have just now related. I am not of that opinion, though I never heard of anybody else that doubted it. To what end, indeed, should they have printed them? It was said to fret the Duke of Newcastle—a poor reason for giving themselves this trouble, especially since the Duke of Newcastle neither was nor deserved to be, either from his capacity or his inclination, one of the principal objects of the resentment of the Prince or his counsellors at this time.

Why Sir Robert Walpole should get them printed, I can easily see cause, as they showed how much more roughly the present King had been used in the quarrel in the last reign than the Prince of Wales was treated in the present disputes; and besides this reason, the circumstance of those three letters only being printed which the

Queen had saved from the flames, was a strong reason ¹⁷³⁷ for suspicion that the publisher of these papers had his materials out of the Hampton Court shop.¹

There were some more circumstances relating to the letters found in the late King's closet which I never knew till now, and are too curious for me not to relate. One was, that in a letter from Earl Stanhope to the late King, when things were pushing to an extremity against the then Prince of Wales, there were these words: "Il est vrai c'est votre fils, mais le Fils de Dieu même a été sacrifié pour le salut du genre humain."

"It is true he is your son, but the Son of God himself was sacrificed for the good of mankind."

In another letter it was said: "Il faut l'enlever; et my Lord Berkeley le prendra sur un vaisseau, et le conduira en aucune partie du monde que votre Majesté l'ordonnera."

"He must be carried off and my Lord Berkeley will take him on board and carry him to any part of the world Your Majesty will order him."

It was no wonder, if the King and Queen believed this to be true, that Sir Robert Walpole, weak as his interest was at the beginning of this reign, had power sufficient to remove Lord Berkeley from the head of the Admiralty.

It is certain that Earl Stanhope and Lord Sunderland were both so afraid of the Prince of Wales at that time, and so inveterately his enemies, that nobody doubted of their being willing and capable to undertake anything to secure themselves, gratify their resentments, and deprive the Prince of the succession to the Crown.

But to return to the present times. The little Court at Kew had as many subdivisions in it, in proportion, as that of Hampton Court. Lady Archibald Hamilton had interest

¹These three letters, which were written in French, had been printed and published in 1717, probably by George II. himself, as Prince of Wales. See Michael, Vol. ii, Appendix I, which reproduces the original French text.

1737 enough to suffer nothing to be done but by her influence, and things were asked which the people who asked them thought they had a right not to have refused to them, and yet they were not granted. The Duke of Marlborough asked for his sister, Lady Bateman, to be Lady of the Bedchamber to the Princess, and Lord Carteret made the same request for his daughter, Lady Dysart; Lord Chesterfield asked that employment for Lady Francis Shirley, and Lady Pembroke for her sister-in-law, Lady How; to Lady Torrington the Prince had promised to keep her employment vacant, and to Lady Archibald to bring in Lady Charlotte Edwin; so that for these two vacancies in the bedchamber the Prince had made six absolute promises, four of which of course it was impossible he could comply with. The only one that was complied with (besides that to Lady Torrington, which was performed by chance and not from principle) was the promise he made to Lady Archibald in favour of Lady Charlotte Edwin, the Duke of Hamilton's sister, whom Lady Archibald prevailed with the Prince to employ as Lady of the Bedchamber though she was not declared, and persuaded the Prince to make economy his excuse for adding at present no more ladies to the Princess's bedchamber; everybody, whilst he made this excuse, knowing the true reason, and reverencing His Royal Highness accordingly.

Besides these difficulties, those men of the Prince's family who did not wish the Prince should go thoroughly into the Opposition, that is, those who had ever acted with the Whigs, had been placed about him by the present Administration, were obliged to Sir Robert Walpole, and wished him well, were very uneasy at Mr. Lyttelton's being declared Secretary to the Prince, as there was nobody more violent in the Opposition, nor anybody a more declared enemy to Sir Robert Walpole.

It was said, and I have reason to believe truly, that on Mr. Lyttelton's being declared Secretary to the Prince, Lord Carnarvon, Lord Baltimore, Mr. Herbert, Mr.

Montagu, and Mr. Evelyn, who used always to vote with 1737
the Court, met and consulted on the present posture of
affairs; and all agreed to acquaint the Prince by deputation (making Mr. Herbert, his Treasurer, their deputy) that they were afraid, by this step of taking Mr. Lyttelton into his service, His Royal Highness designed to go entirely into the measures of those who opposed the Court; and for that reason they thought it their duty to give him the earliest notice that, though they should ever adhere to His Royal Highness in any question in Parliament where he was personally concerned, yet they could not possibly in public matters act in any manner different from the principles by which their conduct had hitherto been influenced, and must always support the King's Government and Administration in the same manner they had formerly done.

What His Royal Highness's answer was I know not, nor could the Queen, Sir Robert Walpole, Mr. Fox, or Mr. Winnington, who all told me the rest, inform me anything about it.

The Princess at this time was said to be extremely uneasy; but as everybody agreed she was of a sullen, silent temper, nobody knew whether her uneasiness proceeded from jealousy, or from dislike of the Prince's measures, or from these domestic and public reasons both joined together. Lady Archibald had her uneasinesses too. She began to be afraid of Lord Carteret, who consulted her in nothing, and had told the Prince he must not promote nobody but Hamiltons, and have a Scotch colony about him. Lady Archibald began therefore to see too late her error in letting the Prince go so strongly into the Opposition, as she only now began to apprehend that all his favours would be disposed of, not by her to her favourites, but by Lord Carteret on parliamentary considerations. She therefore at present railed at Lord Carteret as much as at Sir Robert Walpole, and gave the Prince all the ill impressions of him she could. In this loose,

1737 broken, distracted situation were the little affairs of this little Court.

Bishop Sherlock, who had, contrary to his own custom, as well as to the custom of most of the Bishops, resided a great part of the summer in his diocese, came to the Queen a little before she left Hampton Court, and was very far from obliging her in delivering his sentiments on all this bustle; for though he was far from justifying the conduct of the Prince, yet the comment that accompanied his condemnation of it was very unsatisfactory, and as little adroit as it could have been had he never lived out of his diocese. He told the Queen, if the Prince had taken any advice on this occasion, it could not be from any able counsellors; for by the steps he had taken he had very weakly played the game into the King's hands, and made a blunder he would never be able to retrieve. To which the Queen (as she told me next day) replied, in a very severe tone: "I hope, my Lord, this is not the way you intend to speak your disapprobation of my son's measures anywhere else; for your saying that by his conduct lately he has played the game into the King's hands, one would imagine you thought the game had been before in his own; and though he has made his game still worse than it was, I am far from thinking it was ever a good one, or that he had ever much chance to win."

Madame Walmoden's name had not been mentioned for a long time, when Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey that he had had the King's orders to buy one hundred lottery-tickets for His Majesty, to send to her as he supposed, for he had pressed Sir Robert to get them by the Friday following, and given for his reason that Friday was the German post-day. Sir Robert told Lord Hervey, too, that he had acquainted the Queen with this commission, to avoid her suspecting he had any secret managements for this lady, or was employed in any transactions relating to her which he did not communicate to Her Majesty. He also told Lord Hervey that the King, to save making

this £1,000 disbursement out of his privy purse, had ordered 1737 him to charge the purchase money of these tickets in the secret service; adding that His Majesty, like all other covetous people, fancied always that he gave less when he gave out of a stock which, though equally his own, was money he had never fingered. When first Sir Robert began this account to Lord Hervey, he called Madame Walmoden only the "King's favourite," which Lord Hervey mistaking for Lady Deloraine, said he did not think His Majesty went so deep there; to which Sir Robert, setting him right, replied: "No, I mean the Hanover woman. You are indeed in the right to imagine he does not go so deep to his lying fool here. He'll give her a couple, and think her generously used."

Just before the King left Hampton Court a deputation Oct. 13 of sixteen merchants came to him in great form, with a petition signed by several hundred, to complain of the Spanish depredations in the West Indies, and beg His Majesty's protection and redress. The petition, which specified no particular facts, but was conceived in the strongest general terms, was referred to the Cabinet Council, and orders given by the King for a very strict examination to be made into the allegations of it. And the truth of the fact I believe was that many of our merchants carrying on an illicit trade there, and being a sort of national smugglers, the Spaniards, irritated at this proceeding, had confounded the innocent with the guilty, and often seized ships they had no right to seize as well as those they had, and this way revenged themselves upon England for such illicit traders as had escaped them. Besides this, many of the Spanish Governors in the West Indies, finding their account in conniving at this illicit trade in many instances by receiving money from the English merchants not to prevent it, the merchants were often secure in the ports where they ought to have been searched and stopped, and were all indiscriminately annoyed on the high seas, where the proper distinction

1737 was harder to be made. And the Court of Spain certainly acted unjustly to suffer this national havoc to be made by their guarda-costas, instead of hanging their own Governors for making this the only method of preventing this illicit trade from being carried on with impunity.

I suppose this matter will be thoroughly sifted this year in Parliament.¹

Oct. 28 The Court came to town as usual two days before the King's birthday, and Sir Robert Walpole being in too deep mourning for his wife² to appear on that occasion, he set out for Norfolk the day before the King left Hampton Court.

Those who were in the King's service, or espoused his cause in the quarrel with his son, piqued themselves on contributing to make up the crowd on this first show-day after the separation of the Courts, and by these means the drawing-room, to the great satisfaction both of the King and the Queen, was much fuller than ever it had been on any other 30th of October since the first after His Majesty's accession to the Crown.

The night before Lord Ilay was to follow Sir Robert Walpole into Norfolk, the Queen saw him in the evening in private, for the first time I believe in her life, and to the infinite dissatisfaction of his Grace of Newcastle. Had he known how the Queen treated him in this conference it would have added to his disquiet, for as Her Majesty and Lord Ilay both told me afterwards, she gave up the Duke of Newcastle without any reserve; insomuch that the comment Lord Ilay made on her conduct was that he should have been better pleased had she said less, as what she said, had she thought it at all, must have been more than she could believe of one she let continue in the King's service. But one thing she said to Lord Ilay I am sure was in general true, which was that she had often schooled the Duke of Newcastle for his behaviour towards him and

¹It led to the war of Jenkins' Ear.

²Who had died on the 20th August.

Lord Hervey, and had assured him, if he persisted in endeavouring to make the King's servants uneasy in his service and the execution of their duty, when his only quarrel to them was serving too well, that the King would not endure it. 1737

When the Queen related this to Lord Hervey, she repeated what she had often said on these occasions before, that the poor silly Duke of Newcastle fancied she would not dislike his using Lord Ilay ill because he had once made his court to Lady Suffolk; as if she cared for that now; or, if he was able and willing to do the King any good service at present, that she was fool enough to consider what he had said, or done, or been formerly. "Or if I had reasoned in that way," said she, "I wonder what the Duke of Newcastle himself would have been now. One must take people as one finds them, and when they can be of use to make the whole go on, one must not embarrass one's self by thinking of little silly particulars, that are or ought to be out of the question." Lord Ilay in this conference told the Queen, who was very inquisitive how his brother the Duke of Argyll talked at this time, that with regard to the present disputes between the King and the Prince it was impossible for anybody to talk more reasonably or to be more listed in that cause than his brother; but that his brother had declared too, upon a rumour being spread of some proposal to be made in Parliament to detach the Hanover dominions after the death of the King from the Crown of England, that he would certainly, as far as he could, promote any such scheme. Lord Ilay told Lord Hervey afterwards that the Queen had seemed much set against this scheme; that she had said the Parliament had nothing to do with it, since it was not one of the original conditions in the Act of Settlement. "And though they," continued Her Majesty, "who are for promoting this scheme, may allege that it is no injury to the King, since the separation is not proposed to be made till his death and his successor will consent to it, yet so far it is cer-

1737 tainly an injury, that if the fine scheme (as I hear it is) of my son's consenting to this proposal is to be bought by the King's giving him £50,000 a year more in present, then they take that out of your King's pocket. And who has given that mean jackanapes a right to dismember the dominions of his posterity? I know he would sell not only his reversion in the Electorate, but even in this kingdom, if the Pretender would give him five or six hundred thousand pounds in present; but, thank God! he has neither right nor power to sell his family, though his folly and his knavery may sometimes distress them. However, my Lord, you may assure yourself the King will never hear of any such proposal with patience, but will look on such a motion in Parliament as the highest indignity and insult to him and his family, and all the promoters of it as people who make a pretence of the interest of England to distress and affront him."

When the Queen told Lord Hervey next morning what had passed between her and Lord Ilay on this subject, Lord Hervey said he did not very well understand the constitution of the Empire, but said he should imagine it would not be in the power of the Parliament, even with the King and Prince's consent, to alter the succession to the Electorate; that he should naturally think the consent of the Empire and Emperor must be necessary to such a transfer; and if so, that the same policy which might induce some people here to make it, would prevail at the Court of Vienna to prevent it. For if it was thought that the King of England being at the same time Elector of Hanover made him more liable to the influence and power of the Emperor than he would be if he was only King of England, it must be as much the interest of that Court to keep such an influence as it could be the interest of this country to get rid of it.

It is certain, however, notwithstanding all I have related, that the King did often deliberate in private upon a method to give his German dominions from his eldest to

his second son, and had actually sketches of instruments ¹⁷³⁷ drawn for that purpose; but this was a transaction known to very few, and guessed at only even by Sir Robert Walpole, not communicated to him.¹ The Queen never came thoroughly into this scheme, although she wished it could be effected safely for the Duke, for fear it might involve him in disputes at his father's death in which he might be overpowered, and consequently that what she was projecting for his benefit might turn out to his prejudice, if not to his ruin. Whenever she spoke on this scheme to Lord Hervey, and of her being against it, she put it upon the foot of justice, which she said was due to everybody and even to the Prince, as great a villain as he was; and that he having as good a right to the Electorate as any of his ancestors, it would not be just in the King, who was only a tenant for life in it, to defraud the hereditary rightful heir of succession.

The great indignation therefore that was shown by the Queen at this time on its being suggested that anything of this sort would be stirred in Parliament was partly because she did not think it for the honour of the King's authority that a project of this kind should take its rise there, and partly because the King parting with £50,000 a year and the Prince gaining that sum was to be the medium of such project taking effect.

Lord Hervey having often said to the Queen, and often thought (which two things do not always go together when the prejudices of one body are speaking to those of another) that there was a great similitude in many circumstances between the characters of Nero and the Prince and the Queen having often desired him to connect in writing the particulars which he had detachedly often thrown out in conversation, he drew up the following paper, which he showed to nobody but Her Majesty and the Princess Caroline, who were both too much prejudiced for the author and against the subject not to be infinitely

¹Here the original manuscript has a note by the first Marquess of Bristol: "From page 112 to 121 [*ie.* pp. 857-877] burnt Nov. 28, 1824. Bristol."

1737 better pleased with this production of the one and satire on the other than the thing deserved, and made him read it to them so often that, what very rarely happens, the writer grew more tired of reciting his own work than his auditors of hearing it.

The introduction was a compliment to the Queen, which she did not dislike but did not want to make her relish any abuse upon one whom she so thoroughly detested as she did—one who merited equally the detestation of all those who had anything to do with him and the contempt of those who had not.

*The character of Frederick, Prince of Wales, and parallel between his and that of Nero; being part of a separate work entitled "Characters of the Present Royal Family."*¹

The Prince of Wales was so unlike the Queen, his mother, both in body and mind, that had his birth ever been disputed there would have been no traces of similitude at least to authenticate it. The cheerfulness of his temper was the single quality that would have led anybody to think he could have had any relation to her; and when I have mentioned his temper it is the single ray of light I can throw on his character to gild the otherwise universal blackness that belongs to it. It is surprising how any character made up of so many contradictions should never have the good fortune to have stumbled, *par contre coup* at least, upon any one virtue; but as every vice has its opposite vice as well as its opposite virtue, so this heap of iniquity to complete at once its uniformity in vice in general as well as its contradictions in particular vices, like variety in poisons, whether hot or cold, sweet or bitter, was still poison and never an antidote.

The contradictions he was made up of were these. In the first place he was at once both false and sincere. He

¹The following pages repeat and amplify Lord Hervey's remarks on the Prince of Wales on pp. 306-313.

was false by principle, and sincere from weakness, trying 1737 always to disguise the truths he ought not to have concealed, and from levity discovering those he ought never to have suffered to escape him; so that he never told the truth when he pretended to confide, and was for ever telling the most improper and dishonest truths when anybody else had confided in him. There was but one thing anybody who wished most to gloss his conduct in the point of truth could say to excuse him, which was that he really often did not know whether he spoke truth or not; for as he never considered what he was going to say in the light of being true or false, but which way it would be most useful to his present purpose to relate the circumstances of the subject he was treating, so he seemed to have adopted the manners of the Parthians as described by Justin and the doctrines which Plutarch tells us Lysander always laid down and practised, which was that truth and falsehood were in themselves things quite indifferent, and equally good or bad, according to their utility to him who made use of them.

*Fides dictis promissisque
nulla nisi quatenus expedit.*

Justin, 41, 3.

*Lysander veritatem nihilo
meliozem esse mendacio
dicebat sed utriusque digni-
tatem usu definiri.*

Plutarch.

Another contradiction in this amiable composition was that he was at once both rash and cowardly, capable of undertaking anything, and of persevering in nothing. There was no degree of iniquity that would deter him from an attempt and the smallest degree of danger would fright him from pursuing it.

He was at once both lavish and avaricious, and always both in the wrong place, and without the least ray of either of the virtues often concomitant with these vices; for he was profuse without liberality and avaricious without economy.

He was equally addicted to the weakness of making many friends and many enemies; for there was nobody

1737 too low or too bad for him to court, nor nobody too great or too good for him to betray.

He had all the silly pride of grandeur and all the mean condescension of humility; consequently without any dignity in the one or any insinuation in the other; and his whole conduct in both was like those clumsy tricks in puppet shows, where every wire and string that governs every motion of the puppet, and should always be invisible to the audience, was as manifest as the limbs it moved and consequently all his motives for all his actions as apparent as the actions themselves.¹

He was lewd without vigour, could laugh without being pleased, and weep without being grieved; for which reason his mistresses were never fond of him, his companions never pleased with him, and those he seemed to commiserate never relieved by him.

When he aimed at being merry in company it was in so tiresome a manner that his mirth was to real cheerfulness what wet wood is to a fire, that damps the flame it is brought to feed.

By being always silent to those he hated much, and always talking to those who enjoyed the April sunshine of his present good graces, he was always conferring the negative favour of his neglect on those he meant to shock, and inflicting the most disagreeable marks of his notice on those he meant to caress. For his conversation was always supplied either from old long stories so ill told that no practice could mend him in them; or jokes from bad originals that were yet worse in the copy; or accounts of intrigues he never had; or dissertations on books he had never read, or something or other that always in three minutes manifested his want of sense and his auditors' want of patience.

There was nobody who would not have had sense enough to govern him for a little while and when they were with him, nor anybody who would have been able to

¹The simile is borrowed from Pope's lines on Lord Hervey himself: "And as the prompter breathes, the puppet squeaks."

govern him long or when they were from him; for as his 1737
irresolution would make him take anybody's advice who
happened to be with him, so that jealousy of being thought
to be influenced, so prevalent in weak people and con-
sequently those who are most influenced, always made him
say something depreciating to the next comer of him that
had advised him last.

M. [Neibourg], an old Governor of his, used, as I have
been told, to say of him that he was constant in nothing
but his faults, and that from his youth he had observed
qualities in him that no time could alter, nor any con-
viction get the better of; that he had the most vicious dis-
position, the most depraved nature, and the falsest heart
that ever man had; and that his vices were so far from being
the vices of a [Prince], that they were not the vices of a
gentleman but the mean villainies and tricks of a footman.

What M. [Neibourg] said of [the Prince] puts one
a little in mind of what Suetonius says Tiberius's Governor
said of him. Tiberius's wic-
ked abominable nature, says
Suetonius, appeared even
in his earliest youth, which
Theodorus Gadareus, his
preceptor in rhetoric, seems
to have sagaciously per-
ceived and aptly described,
when in chiding him, he
used to call him dirt mixed
with blood. Though to do

Saeva ac lenta natura ne in
puero quidem latuit; quam
Theodorus Gadareus rhe-
toricae praeceptor et per-
spexisse primus sagaciter,
et assimilasse aptissime
visus est: subinde in objur-
gando appellans eum, πηλὸν
αἵματι πεφυρμένον.

Suet. in *vita Tib.* 57.

[the Prince] justice, as much as I have seen of the dirt in
him, I have discovered nothing of the blood. Not that if he
had a cut in his finger, and that anybody told him the crystal-
ine humour of an eye would make it heal a minute sooner,
that I do not think him capable of putting out any eyes he
could come at without ever reflecting on the blindness he
would cause but making use of their eyes without consider-
ing them in any other light than that of gold-beater skin.

1737 His power of shedding blood, too, as yet is but scanty, so that no just conjecture can be made how he would exercise it if he possessed it; and if he did scruple shedding blood, he could then only reckon himself merciful, as some servants reckon themselves honest when they steal anything but money, for there is no other injury I ever knew him stick at, though ever so base for him to have offered, or ever so undeserved by those who received it.

With these qualifications, true to nobody and seen through by everybody, it is easy to imagine nobody had any regard for him. What regard indeed was it possible anybody could have for a man who had no truth in his words, no justice in his inclination, no integrity in his commerce, no sincerity in his professions, no stability in his attachments, no sense in his conversation, no dignity in his behaviour, and no judgment in his conduct?

I have often thought there was a great similitude in many particulars between the characters of Nero and [the Prince]. Nero at the beginning of his reign was as much admired and loved as [the Prince] at his first arrival in England, and both of them soon after as much detested and despised. Both of them, too, proved this reverse of fortune from the same causes, which were from not being known at first, and from being thoroughly known afterwards; from neither having virtue enough to mend their faults, nor sense enough to disguise them.

Uti merito Trajanus saepius testaretur, procul differre cunctos principes Neronis quinquennio.

Aurelius Victor, *de Cæsaribus: Nero.*

Abditis adhuc vitiis.

Tac. *An.* 13. 1.

Hactenus Nero flagitiis et sceleribus velamenta quæsiuit.

Tac. *An.* 13. 47.

Namque eo dedecore reliquum vitæ egit, uti pigeat, pudeatque memorare hujusmodi quenquam, nedum rectorem gentium, fuisse.

Aur. Vict. *de Cæsaribus.*

His petulancy, his lusts, his luxury, and his avarice, says Suetonius, Nero first privately and sparingly exercised, as if they were only the errors of youth; but time soon demonstrated his faults to be the faults of his nature not of his age.

Each of them too once affected to be fond of their mothers, whom they afterwards avowedly detested; and each of them once by their mothers, were as truly, though undeservedly, loved as they were afterwards truly and not undeservedly hated; and both when they hated their mothers most would sometimes caress them most, thanking them for advice they did not take, and which they were ungrateful enough to hate them for giving, whilst they hired people to abuse and vex their mothers, actuated on these occasions by the two predominant ingredients in the great, worthy, and amiable composition of these two [Princes], *hypocrisy* and fear, prompted (as Tacitus says) by nature, and ad-dicted by habit, to veil their

Petulantiam, libidinem, 1737
luxuriam, avaritiam, sen-sim quidem primo et oc-culte, velut juvenili errore, exercuit; sed naturae illa vitia, non aetatis fuerunt.

Suet. *Nero*, c. 26.

Ferendas parentum iracun-dias, et placandum ani-mum dictitans quo rumo-rem reconciliationis efficere acciperetque Agrippina.

Tac. *An.* 14. 4.

Propalam tamen omnes ho-nores in matrem suam cu-mulabantur.

Tac. *An.* 13. 2.

Jam matri palam et aperte inimicus erat.

Dion. See also Suetonius.

Exueret obsequium in ma-trem. Tac. *An.* 13. 13.

Matrem, dicta factaque sua exquirentem acerbius et corrigentem, hactenus pri-mo gravabatur, ut invidia identidem oneraret.

Suet. *Nero*, 34.

Mox et honore omni et potestate privavit; neque in divexanda quicquam pensi habuit, summissis, et qui Romae morantem litibus et in secessu quiescentem per convicia et jocos inquietar-ent, et perderestatuit. *Ibid.*

Factus natura et consue-

1737 aversion in deceitful blandishments. But as the [Prince] was unlike Nero in nothing but having a worse understanding, the [Queen] resembled Agrippina in nothing but having the best of any woman or man of her time.

Both these [Princes] were extremely amorous, and extremely inconstant; both of them as false to their mistresses, as to their friends, and as incapable by constitution of attachment to the first as they were of fidelity by principle to the last. The similitude of conduct between the Prince's kneeling down in the street to kiss his mother's hand when she made her last visit to his wife in lying-in, though he had not spoken one word to her the whole time she had been there, and Nero's kissing reception of Agrippina the hour before she was to be murdered by his order, is what must strike everybody who ever heard of these two facts.

They both loved expense, building, gardening, fine clothes, feasting, revelling, and to sup in

tudine exercitus velare odium fallacibus blanditiis.

Tac. *An.* 14. 56.

Nero obvius in littora matrem excipit manu et complexu.

Tac. *An.* 14. 4.

Nero matrem prosequitur abeuntem, arctius oculis et pectori haerens.

Ibid.

Divitiarum et pecuniae fructum non alium putabat, quam profusionem.

Suet. *Nero*, 30.

taverns and brothels with low drunken company. They loved, too, in that low drunken company after supper to scour the streets, beat the watch, and molest everybody they met. And if Nero in these scuffles often ran the risk of being beaten and losing his life [the Prince] in an exploit of this sort as narrowly escaped being shot from the Duchess of Buckingham's house in the park whilst he and his company were taking the midnight amusement of breaking her windows. And there is one circumstance in these expeditions still more remarkable, which is that both of them, by changing their clothes and putting on wigs of a different colour from their hair, fancied they were not known, though their conduct and their company always discovered them. But as Tacitus and Suetonius observe on the like occasion that Nero after this grew more fearful, so this adventure of Buckingham House put a stop to these pranks and made His [Royal Highness] more

Nero omnem fere vitam degēbat in popinis.

Dion.

Post crepusculum statim, arrepto pileo vel galero, popinas inibat; circum vicos vagabatur ludibundus, nec sine perniciē tamen.

Suet. *Nero*, 26.

Cum libidinis luxuriose vivebat, crebro ebrius erat, amabat.

Dion.

Occulte noctu per totam urbem debacchabatur.

Dion.

Ac sæpe in ejusmodi rixis oculorum et vitæ periculum adiit, a quodam laticlavio, cuius uxorem attrectaverat, prope ad necem caesus.

Suet. *Nero*, 26.

Quumque hæc faceret, putabat clam homines esse, propterea quod variis generibus vestium et appositis comis uteretur, sed ex comitatu factisque facile agnoscabatur.

Dion.

Multa domi, multa in superiore parte urbis, noctu atque interdiu latitans libidinosē fecit; in cauponas ingrediebatur et ut privatus omnia loca pervagabatur.

Dion.

1737 cautious, the affair being much talked of, and the Duchess of Buckingham having put an advertisement into one of the daily papers to assure those who offered any insult of this kind to her or her house for the future should be received suitably to their practice and not to their rank. The Earl of Berkshire and his lady made great complaints of the outrage they received the same night, but excuses were privately made to them and the thing hushed up. Both of them used to sup, too, at public houses and taverns with all the scoundrel low common whores of the town.

Both Nero and [the Prince] piqued themselves not only, like Princes, upon being patrons of arts and literature, but upon being great proficient in arts and letters themselves, both in verse and prose; each of them making most miserable compositions in both kinds of their own and without shame or hesitation fathering those of other people. For Seneca and

Nero itinera urbis et lupanaria et diverticula, veste servili in dissimulationem sui compositus, pererrabat.

Tac. *An.* 13. 25.

Nero autem metuentior in posterum.

Tac. *An.* 13. 25.

Quare nunquam postea se publico illud horae sine tribunis commisit, procul et occulte subsequen-
tibus.

Suet. *Nero*, 26.

Coenitabat nonnunquam inter scortorum totius urbis ambubaiarumque ministeria.

Suet. *Nero*, 27.

Ad poeticam pronus, carmina libenter ac sine labore composuit. Suet. *Nero*, 52.

Lectis iis, quae Seneca scripserat. Dion.

Oratio a Seneca composita (pro Nerone) multum cultus praeferret, ut fuit illi viro ingenium amoenum et temporis illius auribus accommodatum. Primum ex iis qui rerum potiti essent Neronem alienae facundiae eguisse. Tac. *An.* 13. 3.

Petronius did not compose more speeches and poems for the one than Mr. Hedges and Lord Hervey did ballads and sonnets for the other. And as Seneca in dying was forced to deposit in secret hands the papers he had written against Nero lest Nero should destroy them, so Lord Hervey living was forced once to lodge his papers in other hands for fear the Prince should destroy both them and him.

If Nero was violent in taking this or that party in the theatre or the circus, the [Prince] was not less so in those of the operas. Nero was not more vehement in the cause of the greens and blues, than [the Prince] for Lincoln's Inn Fields against the Haymarket. Nor did Nero distinguish Paris the dancer, or Menecrates the harper, or Spiculus the gladiator, more than His [Royal Highness] did Dunoyer the dancer, who was the constant companion for years together of all his private hours, but particularly at Kew during his disgrace, which tallies

Nero puerilibus annis statim 1737
vividum animum in alia detorsit: cantus aut regimen equorum—et aliquando, carminibus pangendis. *Ibid.*

In theatro, spectante universo populo, poemata quaedam sua, scripta de rebus Trojanis, legit. Cogitabat de rebus gestis Romanorum versibus scribere. Dion.

Annaeus Cornutus neminem eos lecturum dixit; et ea causa a Nerone relegatus fuit. *Ibid.*

Neque prius sibi Seneca manus attulit quam libellum quem scribatat emendavisset, et alia quaedam apud aliquos deposuisset, quod metueret ne perirent, si Neronis in manus venissent. Dion.

Ludicram quoque licentiam et fautores histrionum velut in proelia convertit.

Tac. *An.* 13. 25.

Seditionibus pantomimorum ex parte proscenii superiori signifer simul ac spectator aderat.

Suet. *Nero*, 26.

Paris solitus luxus Neronis intendere.

Tac. *An.* 13. 20.

Paridem saltatorem. Παρίν τὸν ὀρχηστὴν. Dion.

1737 also with what Suetonius says of Nero during his disgrace before he was Emperor.

Menecraten citharædum, et Spiculum mirmillonem triumphalium virorum patrimoniis aedibusque donavit.

Suet. *Nero*, 30.

Vide etiam Tac. An.

Matre etiam relegata, paene inops atque egens, apud amitam Lepidam nutritus est cum saltatore et tonsore.

Suet. 6.

The [Prince] was fond of his violoncello, as Nero of his harp, and if the [Prince] only sung, played, and acted in private, whilst the other performed all these parts in public,¹ I dare say it was owing to no other cause, than the one being subject to control and the other above it; otherwise the same inclination with the same power would have taken the same steps. Good sense or shame would have restrained the one as little as it did the other, and had the English [Prince], like the Roman Emperor, had nothing to fear but ridicule, he would have incurred it like the other and have played the same absurd part in London that Nero did in Rome, Naples, or Athens. Nor would anybody say this was either an invidious suggestion or unnatural conjecture, who had ever, like me, seen and heard this [royal] fiddler once or twice a week during this whole summer at Kensington seated close to an open window of his apartment, with his violoncello between his legs, singing French and Italian songs to his own playing for an hour or two together, whilst his audience was composed of all the underling servants and rabble of the palace.

Atque etiam spectari saepius voluit; positoque in hortis inter servitia et sordidam plebem rudimento universorum se oculis praebeuit.

Suet. *Nero*, 22.

¹Nero quum multa ridicule faceret, tum aliquando in theatri orchestram inspectante universo populo descendit. Dion.—*Note by Lord Hervey.*

What made this scene more remarkable was that as His [Royal Highness] exhibited this gratis amusement, truly at his own expense, late in the evening, so the multitude of lights he had in his royal music booth where he performed made this object of theatrical attention still more conspicuous than he could have been at noonday. And the window of the apartment where he played looking into one of the back courts of the palace, there was a sort of gradation of spectators like that of plebeians, knights and patricians in the Roman theatres, the colonnade below being filled with all the footmen, scullions, postillions, applewomen, shoeboys, and lower order of domestics, whilst the first floor windows were thronged with chambermaids and *valets de chambre*, and the garret, like the upper gallery, stuffed with laundry maids and their gallants. And as Vindex said of Nero in this situation, who would prostitute the names of Cæsar, Emperor, Claudius, and Augustus by giving

Stetique Caesar in scena, 1737
 habitu cithæraedi. Quin etiam ipse imperator dixit: Domini mei, audite me libenter. Et Augustus cecinit Attin quendam et Bacchas, coram magno militum numero et universo populo, quantum sedes capiebant: etsi ut traditum est, tam parva obscuraque voce erat, ut risum fletumque simul omnibus excitaret.

Dion.

In ipso theatro atque in orchestra gerentem citharam illum vidi. Quis istum Caesarem, quis Imperatorem, quis Augustum appellabit. Ne polluantur quaeso tam sancta nomina, etc.

Dion.

1737 them to this buffoon harper? so might anybody with equal justness have asked how much does such a buffoon fiddler debase the title of a Prince of Wales.

There was nothing which either of these two princes affected so much as popularity, though both mistook the way to it and made themselves the contempt of those they courted. Both bragged, too, by what good rules they intended to govern, the Prince saying he would make Alfred his pattern, as Nero said he would tread in the steps of Augustus; and before they had opportunities of showing the world their true nature and disposition by giving a loose to their real temper they took every occasion to give the world good impressions of their generosity, humanity, and complaisance, declaring themselves for the abolition or reduction of heavy taxes, and the one professing to have the interest of the City of London as much at heart as the other that of Rome. Nero's wishing he had never learnt to write when

Maxime autem popularitate efferebatur, omnium aemulus, qui quoquo modo animum vulgi moverent.

Suet. *Nero*, 53.

Atque ut certiores adhuc indolem ostenderet, ex Augusti praescripto imperaturum se, professus, neque liberalitatis, neque clementiae, neque comitatis exhibendae ullam occasionem omisit.

Suet. *Nero*, 10.

Formam futuri principatus praescripsit, ea maxime declinans quorum recens flagrabat invidia.—Nihil in penetibus suis venale aut ambitioni pervium; discretam domum et rem publicam. Teneret antiqua munia senatus.—Nec defuit fides.

Tac. *An.* 13. 4-5.

Graviora vectigalia abolevit aut minuit.—Dubitavit Nero an cuncta vectigalia omitti juberet.

Tac. *An.* 13. 50.

Et cum de supplicio cuiusdam capite damnati, ut ex

he was to sign an order for the execution of a common malefactor is a piece of nauseous silly affectation so much in the style of the Prince that whenever this country shall have the misfortune to see His Royal Highness in a capacity of acting that farce I doubt not but the parallel will be as just in this grimace as any other disagreeable feature.

When the Senate came to Nero to compliment him upon some occasion his answer was exactly the same with the Prince's to the compliment of the Parliament when they came to him on his marriage; which was that he hoped he should one day deserve their good opinion. And as Nero used to hire people to clap his performances in the theatre, so the Prince hired people to clap and hurrah his appearance there, at least as it was generally reported and believed the first time he went to the play after he was turned out of St. James's.

There is one short sentence in Suetonius relating to the troops in England

more subscriberet, admo- 1737
neretur: Quam vellem (inquit) nescire litteras.

Suet. *Nero*, 10.

Exclamasti, vellem nescire litteras.

Seneca, *de Clementia*, l. 2. c. 1.

Agenti senatui gratias respondit: Cum meruero.

Suet. *Nero*, 10.

Assistebant ei in theatro Burrus et Seneca, ut magistri, suggerentes aliquid: quumque dixisset, plaudabant manibus, ut reliquos ad idem faciendum inducerent. Erant ob eam causam parata quinque millia militum, qui Augustales nominati incipiebant eum laudibus extollere: post hos caeteri omnes inviti acclamare cgebantur.

Dion.

1737 that is applicable on this occasion, and makes one smile from the oddness of it, which is that Nero often talked of taking the Army in England quite away. What follows, I own, I believe will never be applicable, which is that Nero's reason for not taking this step was the fear of casting a reflection on the reputation of his father.

If Nero drove chariots and performed other exercises for prizes in the Circus Maximus and amid all the scum of Rome, the Prince's cricket-matches, in which he performed himself among a less numerous though not a more creditable throng upon public commons, is in the same style of character, and considering their different situations may be justly reckoned alike.

The Prince was as soon weary of the Princess of Saxe-Gotha's bed as Nero was of Octavia's and seemed to be of the same opinion with Nero when he said that he thought the honours of her station were enough for her.

Etiam ex Britannia deducere exercitum cogitavit.

Suet. Nero, 18.

Nec nisi verecundia, ne obrectare parentis gloriæ videretur, destitit.

Suet. Nero, 18.

Mox et ipse aurigare atque etiam spectari saepius voluit; positoque in hortis inter servitia et sordidam plebem rudimento universorum se oculis in circo maximo praeibit.

Suet. Nero, 22.

Uxore ab Octavia, nobili quidem et probitatis spectatae, abhorrebat.

Tac. An. 13. 12.

Octaviae consuetudinem cito aspernatus, corripientibus amicis, sufficere illi debere (respondit) uxoria ornamenta. Suet. Nero, 35.

Both of them, too, were once very near marrying much below themselves. Nero killed his wife when she was with child; the Prince had only like to have killed his wife when she was in labour.

What I know of the similitude between the Prince's character and that of Nero's with regard to consulting and believing in fortune-tellers I am not at liberty to relate; but what Suetonius says of Nero on this subject in his 56th Chapter I could if I would make full as applicable to His Royal Highness as any other part of Nero's character.

To give all the particulars of the obligations these two princes had to their mothers, the hatred they had for them, and the dissimulation with which they long and often endeavoured to conceal that hatred, would be endless. That Nero murdered his, and never behaved with so much seeming tenderness as the hour before she was to be assassinated, all authors agree.

Acten libertam, paulum a- 1737
fuit, quin justo matrimonio
sibi conjungeret.

Suet. *Nero*, 28.

Poppaea Sabina etiam a
Nerone interfecta fuit quam
pregnantem seu volens
seu per imprudentiam cal-
cibus oppressit.

Dion.

Religionum usquequaque
contemtor, praeter unius
deae Syriae. Hanc mox ita
sprevit, ut urina contamina-
ret; alia superstitione cap-
tus, in qua sola pertina-
cissime haesit—volebatque
credi monitione ejus futura
praenosceret.

Suet. *Nero*, 56.

Post coenam tempus media
nocte eam summa benevo-
lencia complexus, atque oc-
ulos ejus et manus oscula-
tus, comitatusque abeun-
tem dixit, "vale, mea mater,
ac salva esto, cura valetudi-
nem tuam, nam in te tam
ipse vivo, tam per te regno."

Dion. Cass.

Reconciliatione simulata,
illam jucundissimis literis
Baiae evocavit—protraxit
convivium. Repetentique
Baulos, machinosum navig-

1737 By the greatest part of Suetonius's description of Nero's person, one would imagine he was drawing a prophetic picture of the Prince of Wales. His stature, he says, was rather less than that of a common sized man, his body dirty and spotted. If Suetonius means spotted by that dirt dried on, I can make affidavit of having seen the Prince's legs and arms in the same condition. His hair was light with a yellowish cast, and his face fair but not handsome; his eyes grey like a cat and very dull; his legs very slender and his constitution healthy.

To conclude, as there was no species of extravagance of which these two blessings to their country and their family were not capable to dissipate money, so there was no species of sordidness or injustice of which they were not capable to acquire it, both of them, as I have said before, being by turns both rapacious and profuse. They were both of them tricking and unfeeling, fickle and ungrateful; both of them

ium obtulit, hilare prosecutus atque in digressu papillas quoque exosculatus, reliquum temporis cum magna trepidatione vigilavit, coeptorum opperiens exitum.

Suet. *Nero*, 34.

Statura fuit poene justa, corpore maculoso et foedo, sufflavo capillo, vultu pulchro magis quam venusto, oculis caesiis et hebetioribus, gracillimis cruribus, valetudine prospera.

Suet. *Nero*, 51.

Quare nec largiendi nec absumendi modum tenuit.

Suet. *Nero*, 30.

Hinc magnam capit pecuniam consumere, magnam iniquis rationibus quaerere.

Dion.

Narcisso per avaritiam ac prodigentiam mire Nero congruebat.

Tac. *An.* 13. 1.

Verum ut spes fefellit, destitutus atque ita jam exhaustus et egens, calumniis rapinisque intendit animum, etc. Suet. *Nero*, 32.

ostentatious and mean, insolent and timorous; and both of 1737
them contemptible in grandeur and unpitied in disgrace;
both of them knaves and both of them liars; and the only
difference I know between them is that Nero had infinitely
more power, a good deal more sense, and a little more
cruelty, at least that appeared.

There are two circumstances now I must add, which are
that Nero's chief anger, after that against his mother, was
levelled at Pallas the minister of his father, whom his
mother always protected, and that Nero had but one child
which was a daughter, and called Augusta. She died
young, and this puts me in mind of another circumstance
in which these two princely blessings to the world will, I
hope, resemble one another, which is that of Nero's re-
joicing mankind with his death (the only way he ever did
rejoice them) when he was but thirty-two years old; and
as they were both born in the same month, that of January,
so I hope they will both die at the same age.

It is possible I may be thought to have drawn this paral-
lel from prejudice or malice, and by the first perhaps I may
have been influenced without knowing it; but by the last,
if I felt that unhappy passion, a weapon more fatal always
to him who wields it than to those against whom its point
is directed, if I felt this instigation, I say, to asperse, and
sought to gratify it, how doubly weak and injudicious I
must be to put a curb upon my lips whilst I am living and
could hurt, or at least tease, the object of that passion
whilst I am living, and give a loose to its rage upon paper
to record these things which, let them be ever so bitterly
reported, or ever so universally believed, from the date
of their appearance, if the imprudence of those who come
after me should ever let them appear, can never either
pleasure me or mortify him, as pain and pleasure, at least
of this kind, if not of all, will then be sensations long for-
gotten and unknown to us both; his ear as deaf to the

1737 voice of truth as his lips were ever dumb to it and my mind no more susceptible of the pleasure of repaying all his inveteracy with this little ridicule than it would be now of paying it in kind.

Besides, if the notoriety of the qualities and conduct will not justify this character, these writings can never make such reflections current; and if the parallel shall hereafter be found just, why should it be deemed to be drawn by the enmity of an unfair foe, rather than by the truth of a faithful historian?

One circumstance that happened about this time will in part contribute to justify the likeness of this picture, and therefore I will relate it.

When the [Prince] bought his house in Pall Mall of Lord Chesterfield, which cost £6,000, not having money to pay for it, he borrowed this sum of his treasurer, Mr. Hedges, and obliged himself to repay it at a particular time that expired just as he grew tired of Mr. Dodington's administration and before Dodington had discovered that he was so. The [Prince] therefore, taking advantage of the favour which he still showed and no longer felt towards this disgraced minor minister, who, like a great heir, died before he came of age, borrowed this sum of £6,000 of him to pay Mr. Hedges and then with as little judgment as shame or honesty bragged to Mr. Hedges of having overreached Dodington and said: "With all his parts I have wheedled him out of a sum of money for the payment of which he has no security if I die, and which, God knows, he may wait long enough for if I live."

This Mr. Hedges, who was really a worthy as well as a sensible man, told himself to me, saying at the same time: "You see, my Lord, into what honest and just hands the care and government of this country is like one day to be committed." To which I answered that I could not deny but this reflection, if I was disposed (which thank God I am not) to see things in black, would administer a most melancholy prospect to anybody that has a great family

and a great estate in it, were it not for the consolation of 1737
hoping that the impotence of his understanding will prove
an antidote to the iniquity of his disposition; a hope I can
more easily indulge as it has always been my opinion, and
founded on observation, that a King, at least in this
country, let his views be ever so bad, without a very good
head will only ruin himself. Edward II., Richard II.,
Henry VI., Charles I., and James II., are all examples of
it. And as Kings have so little to get and so much to loose,
whenever I hate any of them much I should wish them to
begin a scramble where they play gold and diamonds
against brass-farthings and bits of glass.

What reception this paper met with I have already
related in the introduction to it; and must now as well as
I can connect the particulars of a diary of the most melan-
choly fortnight I ever passed in my life, not only from the
inquietude of my own mind, but from the scene of distress
all around me, not seeing a single creature in the Queen's
apartment (out of which I passed very few hours of
this fortnight) that either for public or private reasons,
and many for both, was not filled with the most careful
thoughts, agitated with the greatest anxiety, and giving
way without disguise to every symptom of the two most
turbulent sensations in a human mind, grief and fear.

On Wednesday, the 9th of November, the Queen was
taken ill in the morning at her new library in St. James's
Park. She called her complaint the colic, her stomach and
bowels giving her great pain. She came home, took Daffy's
Elixir by Dr. Tesier, the German and house-physician's
advice; but was in such great pain, and so uneasy with
frequent reachings to vomit, that she went into bed. How-
ever, when the clock struck two, and the King proposed
sending Lord Grantham to dismiss the company, and
declare there would be no drawing-room, she, according to
the custom of the family, not caring to own, or at least to
have it generally known, how ill she was, told the King
she was much better, that she would get up and see the

1737 company as usual. As soon as she came into the drawing-room she came up to Lord Hervey and said: "Is it not intolerable at my age to be plagued with a new distemper? Here is this nasty colic that I had at Hampton Court come again." The Queen had twice this summer at Hampton Court been seized with a vomiting and purging, which had lasted in the most violent manner for three or four hours, and then left her so easy and well that she had played the same night in the drawing-room as usual, and talked with almost the same cheerfulness. This made Lord Hervey less alarmed than he otherwise would have been at her present disorder, for she looked extremely ill, and complained much more than was her custom to do when she suffered most. Lord Hervey asked her what she had taken, and when she told him, he replied: "For God's sake, Madam, go to your own room; what have you to do here?" She then went and talked a little to the rest of the company, and coming back again to Lord Hervey, said: "I am not able to entertain people." "Would to God," replied Lord Hervey, "the King would have done talking of the Dragon of Wantley, and release you." (This was a new silly farce which everybody at this time went to see.) At last the King went away, telling the Queen as he went by that she had overlooked the Duchess of Norfolk. The Queen made her excuse for having done so to the Duchess of Norfolk, the last person she ever spoke to in public, and then retired, going immediately into bed, where she grew worse every moment.

At seven o'clock, when Lord Hervey returned to St. James's from M. de Cambis's, the French ambassador's, where he dined that day, he went up to the Queen's apartment and found her in bed, with the Princess Caroline only in the room, the King being gone, as usual at that hour, to play in the Princess Emily's apartment. The Queen asked Lord Hervey what he used to take in his violent fits of the colic; and Lord Hervey, imagining the Queen's pain to proceed from a goutish humour in her

stomach that should be driven from that dangerous seat 1737 into her limbs, told her nothing ever gave him immediate ease but strong things. To which the Queen replied: "Pshaw! you think now like all the other fools, that this is the pain of an old nasty stinking gout." But her vomitings, or rather her reachings, together with such acute pain, continuing in a degree that she could not lie one moment quiet, she said about an hour after to Lord Hervey, "Give me what you will, I will take it"; and the Princess Caroline bidding him not lose this opportunity, he only said to the Queen he would fetch the strongest thing he could get, telling her at the same time that his former experience of violent fits of the colic was such that he was sure all the angels in heaven together could not procure her immediate ease without it.

He fetched some snake-root and brandy, and asking Dr. Tesier, who was in the outward room, whether he might venture to give it her, Dr. Tesier, who was naturally timid, and made more so by the manner in which he had been talked to in the King's illness last year, said the Queen's pulse was very high and feverish, and as she was unused to drinking anything strong, he could not affirm that this very strong cordial would do her no hurt. Lord Hervey then asked him if he should propose to the King to call in another physician, and if he had any objection to Broxholme; and Dr. Tesier saying he wished it extremely, but did not dare to propose it himself to the King, Lord Hervey told Princess Caroline what had passed; that he did not dare to take upon him to give the snake-root without Tesier's consent; and would, if she approved, propose to the King that Dr. Broxholme might be called in.

The Princess Caroline consented, and Lord Hervey speaking to the King, who was now returned from Princess Emily's apartment, and began to be alarmed, Dr. Broxholme was immediately sent for by Lord Hervey. When he came, Tesier and he agreed to give the Queen immediately some snake-root with Sir Walter Raleigh's

1737 cordial; but this cordial being long in preparing, and Ranby, house-surgeon to the King, a sensible fellow and a favourite of Lord Hervey's, telling Lord Hervey that insisting on these occasions upon a cordial with this name or t'other name was mere quackery, and that no cordial was better than another in these cases but in proportion to its strength, Lord Hervey got some usquebaugh immediately, and telling Princess Caroline what Ranby had said, the usquebaugh was immediately given to the Queen, who kept it about half an hour, which was about twenty-nine minutes longer than she had kept anything else, but then brought it up. Soon after the snake-root and Sir Walter Raleigh's cordial arrived from the apothecary's; it was taken and thrown up about an hour after. All these strong things, twice Daffy's Elixir, mint-water, usquebaugh, snake-root, and Sir Walter Raleigh's cordial, had, without easing the Queen's pain, so increased her fever, that the doctors ordered Ranby to bleed her twelve ounces immediately. She took a glister but it came from her just as it went into her.

The Princess Caroline had been extremely ill all this summer at Hampton Court of rheumatic pains, and growing every day worse, notwithstanding all the medicines that had been given her in what the physicians call a regular way, Lord Hervey upon her coming to town had persuaded her to take Ward's Pill, a nostrum belonging to one Ward, an excellent medicine not only in rheumatism but in several cases, which, for being so, all the physicians and surgeons endeavoured to decry.

Princess Caroline, persuaded by Lord Hervey, had taken this medicine since her arrival in London, with the privy rather than consent of the King and Queen, and keeping it a secret to everybody else; but in four times taking only she had found such benefit that, notwithstanding she had been unable to walk or get up from her chair without help when she began it, she was now quite free from pain, and could walk almost as well as she ever

could have done in her life. This medicine vomits, purges, 1737 and sweats in a great degree. However, her recovery being not yet perfect, the King and Queen were both extremely solicitous to have her go to bed, which she did not do till two o'clock in the morning. The King, inconveniently both to himself and the Queen, lay on the Queen's bed all night in his nightgown, where he could not sleep, nor she turn about easily.

Early in the morning of Thursday the 10th the Queen was blooded twelve ounces more, upon which her fever, that had been very high all night, abated, and everybody but herself thought she was better. When the King went to his own side to change his linen, she told the Princess Caroline it signified nothing what they did to her, for she should certainly die, and added: "Poor Caroline! you are very ill too; we shall soon meet again in another place."

Her vomiting was suspended for a few hours this morning; but nothing passed downwards and two glisters she took returned immediately and pure. However, on this amendment, as everybody called it, but few really thought it, the King resolved to have a levee and that the Princess Emily should see the company at the usual hour of the Queen's going into her drawing-room; and to show what odd and inconsistent particulars we are all composed of, this being the day the Foreign Ministers came to Court, the King, in the midst of all his real and great concern for the Queen, sent to his pages to bid them be sure to have his last new ruffles sewed on upon the shirt he was to put on that day at his public dressing. Such sort of particulars will seem very trifling to those who do not think, like me, that trifling circumstances often let one more into people's tempers and characters than those parts of their conduct that are of greater importance, from which one frequently knows no more of their natural turn of mind than one does of their natural gait whilst they are dancing.

Mrs. Herbert, sister-in-law to Lord Pembroke, happened to be the Bedchamber-Woman in waiting this

1737 week on the Queen, and though she was a personal and warm enemy, and had long been so, to Sir Robert Walpole, yet she was so sensible, so well-bred, so handy, so cheerful, and so agreeable to the Queen, that the Queen desired if she should continue ill longer than that week that Mrs. Herbert would continue in waiting. Mrs. Herbert, Mrs. Selwyn, and Mrs. Brudenel were the only Bed-chamber-Women who attended the Queen during her whole illness, Lady Sundon being very ill at Bath, and the rest absent elsewhere. None of the Ladies of her Bed-chamber were admitted to her at all.

Lord Hervey asked the Duke of Newcastle this morning if he would not send for Sir Robert Walpole, and the Duke of Newcastle said he had mentioned it, but that the Princess Emily had told him the King and Queen would both dislike he should; but his Grace added he would write that night to Houghton to say how the Queen was, and disguise nothing. He did so, and Princess Emily added a postscript in the letter, softening the state of things, and begging Sir Robert Walpole by all means not to think of coming to town.

Lord Hervey wrote that night, softening nothing, and advising him by all means to come, but did not then tell Sir Robert what he thought he plainly perceived, that the Princess Emily and the Duke of Newcastle had no mind he should come; the Princess Emily hoping, I believe, that the Queen would not take his staying at Houghton well; and the Duke of Newcastle, joined to that reason, proposing perhaps by Sir Robert's absence to have the King more to himself. If that was his scheme, he was disappointed; for after this day the King saw no Minister, nor any one man-servant that belonged to him but Lord Hervey, who was never out of the Queen's apartment for above four or five hours at most at a time during her whole illness, and sometimes not two in the twenty-four, and never went from the King without his desiring him to come back as soon as he could.

This evening, whilst the Princess Caroline and he were 1737 alone with the Queen, she complaining and they comforting, she often said: "I have an ill which nobody knows of"; which they both understood to mean nothing more than that she felt what she could not describe, and more than anybody imagined. Princess Caroline's extreme concern and almost continual weeping gave her a return of her rheumatism, which settled in her back; and added to this, she had from this violent and perpetual weeping a frequent bleeding at her nose, and in great quantities. The King and Queen, therefore, both persuaded her to go to bed, and insisted on her doing so about midnight, Lord Hervey promising her to sit up, and giving his word he would frequently come and inform her how the Queen was exactly, and without the least disguise.

This night two more physicians were called in, Sir Hans Sloane and Dr. Hulse, who ordered blisters and aperients. These came up, like every other thing, soon after she had swallowed it, and the blisters, though a remedy to which the King and Queen had often declared themselves very averse, were put upon her legs.

Lord Hervey went once or twice in the night, as he had promised, to Princess Caroline; the King sat up in the Queen's room, and Princess Emily lay on a couch in Mrs. Herbert's.

At six o'clock on Friday morning the Queen was again blooded, upon which her fever went almost entirely off; but the total stoppage and frequent vomitings still continued.

On Friday Lord Hervey again desired the Duke of Newcastle to send an express for Sir Robert Walpole, which his Grace at last thought fit to do; but sending the messenger round by Euston, where the Duke of Grafton then was, and the messenger by accident or order loitering on the road, Sir Robert Walpole had not these letters till Saturday evening, and set not out for London till Sunday morning.

On Friday Lord Hervey, hearing the Prince was come

1737 from Kew to Carlton House in Pall Mall, suspected he had done so in order to come to St. James's to inquire after the Queen, and perhaps to ask to see her; and that no resolution on such step might be taken by the King in a hurry, Lord Hervey told the King his conjecture, and asked His Majesty, in case it should prove a true one, what he would have done. The King said: "If the puppy should, in one of his impertinent affected airs of duty and affection, dare to come to St. James's, I order you to go to the scoundrel and tell him I wonder at his impudence for daring to come here; that he has my orders already, and knows my pleasure, and bid him go about his business; for his poor mother is not in a condition to see him act his false, whining, cringing tricks now, nor am I in a humour to bear his impertinence; and bid him trouble me with no more messages, but get out of my house."

About an hour or two afterwards, whilst Lord Hervey was sitting with the Duke, drinking tea in the Queen's apartment, a message came by one of the Queen's pages to the Duke to tell him Lady Pembroke, the Queen's lady then in waiting, desired to speak with His Royal Highness in the passage. Lord Hervey, telling the Duke he suspected this might prove something relative to the Prince, said he would go with him. Accordingly he went, and Lady Pembroke told the Duke Lord North had just been with her from the Prince to desire her, in the Prince's name, to let the King and Queen know His Royal Highness was in the utmost affliction upon hearing of the Queen's illness, was come to London in order to hear more frequently how she did, and that the only thing that could alleviate his great concern at this time was to be admitted to the honour of seeing her.

The Duke said: "I am not a proper person, Madam, to take the charge of this message, but there is Lord Hervey, who is the only one of papa's servants that sees him at present, and is just going to him; if you will deliver it to him, he will certainly let the King know."

Accordingly, Lady Pembroke repeated the message 1737
over again to Lord Hervey, and Lord Hervey assured her
he would take the first opportunity to acquaint the King
with it.

When Lord Hervey told the King what had passed,
His Majesty flew into as great a rage as he could have
done had he not been prepared. "This," said he, "is like
one of the scoundrel's tricks; it is just of a piece with his
kneeling down in the dirt before the mob to kiss her hand
at the coach-door when she came from Hampton Court
to see the Princess, though he had not spoken one word to
her during her whole visit. I always hated the rascal, but
now I hate him yet worse than ever. He wants to come
and insult his poor dying mother; but she shall not see
him; you have heard her, and all my daughters have heard
her very often this year at Hampton Court, desire me, if
she should be ill and out of her senses, that I would never
let him come near her; and whilst she had her senses, she
was sure she would never desire it. No, no! he shall not
come and act any of his silly plays here, false, lying,
cowardly, nauseous, puppy. Besides, supposing the Queen
loved him as much as she hates him, it would be as im-
proper for her to see him in that case as it is now. She is
not in a condition to bear the emotion. Therefore, my
Lord, you know my thoughts. I have told you already the
answer I would have given; you have but to tell it my Lord
North, and be sure not to forget to say I will be plagued
with no more messages."

Lord Hervey told the King, if he delivered a verbal
message only, that the Prince and his people would cer-
tainly engraft a thousand lies upon it, and without a pos-
sibility of being disproved.

"It is no matter for that," replied the King, "I will not
honour him with another written message, nor have the
appearance of giving myself at this time so much trouble
about him."

"Nor would I have Your Majesty," answered Lord

1737 Hervey; "but if you will give me leave, as for the help of my own memory, to put Your Majesty's commands down in writing, and only let me read that paper, without delivering it, Your Majesty will at once show that you will neither honour them with a written message nor trust them with a verbal one."

"You are in the right," said the King: "do so. Put down in writing what you are to say, and pray see who are in the rooms, and take two people of quality and credit along with you, to be by when you read the paper to Lord North, that they may be witnesses to what passes; for else that pack of knaves and liars (Cartouche's gang, as the poor Queen always calls them) are capable of reporting you to have said things you never thought of."

Lord Hervey went immediately to put down what he was to say in writing, and desired the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Pembroke to go along with him to Lord North, telling them that he had already named them to the King for that purpose, and acquainting them at the same time with all the material part of what I have already related concerning this transaction.

Lord Pembroke, Lord Hervey chose as a man of credit; and the Duke of Newcastle, because he thought it would mortify him to play subaltern in an occurrence where Lord Hervey acted the principal part—a *petitesse* in Lord Hervey's way of thinking, but one he liked to indulge.

The message Lord Hervey drew was as follows:

Message delivered by Lord Hervey by word of mouth to Lord North at St. James's, on Friday, November 11, 1737, in the presence of the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Pembroke.

I have acquainted the King with the message sent to Lady Pembroke, and His Majesty has ordered me to say that in the present situation and circumstances His Majesty does not think fit that the Prince should see the Queen, and therefore expects he should not come to St. James's.

The King thought this draft much too mild, but after a little persuasion consented to it; as also (at Lord Hervey's

request) to see the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Pembroke 1737 only for a minute, to read this paper to them, to tell them he had ordered Lord Hervey to deliver this message, and to order them to be present when he did so; and the King again, in their presence, repeated his commands to Lord Hervey to be sure not to give a copy of that paper, with his reasons, already mentioned, why he would not have it done, as well as those for his ordering the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Pembroke to be witnesses to what passed at this interview, cutting Lord Pembroke very short, who would have offered some palliatives to the wording of the message, and telling him: "My Lord, you are always for softening, and I think it is much too soft already for such a villain and a scoundrel; it is much softer than I ordered Lord Hervey to prepare it; so pray go, and let it be given this moment, and be sure I am plagued with no more impertinence of this sort, for I will neither have the poor Queen disturbed with his silly noise, nor will I be troubled with it again myself."

When Lord Hervey delivered the message, Lord North desired he might have a copy of it in writing, to which Lord Pembroke answered that Lord Hervey had the King's positive commands not to give it in writing; and Lord Hervey added that he would read it as often as Lord North pleased, and after hearing it three or four times, Lord North took his leave.

In the afternoon the Queen said to the King, she wondered the Griff (the nickname of the Prince) had not sent to ask to see her yet, it would be so like one of his filthy *parasites*; "but sooner or later I am sure one shall be plagued with some message of that sort, because he will think it will have a good air in the world to ask to see me; and perhaps hopes I shall be fool enough to let him come, and give him the pleasure of seeing my last breath go out of my body, by which means he would have the joy of knowing I was dead five minutes sooner than he could know it in Pall Mall."

1737 The King bid her not be under any apprehensions of a trouble of this kind, for that he had already taken care to prevent it; and then related to her every circumstance of the message he had received, and the answer he had returned by Lord Hervey. The King told the Queen, too, that if she had the least mind to see her son, he had no objection to it, and begged her to do just what she liked. "I am so far," said the Queen, "from desiring to see him, that nothing but your absolute commands should ever make me consent to it. For what should I see him? For him to tell me a hundred lies, and to give myself at this time a great deal of trouble to no purpose. If anything I could say to him would alter his behaviour, I would see him with all my heart; but I know that is impossible. Whatever advice I gave him he would thank me for, *pleurerait comme un veau* all the while I was speaking, and swear to follow my directions; and would laugh at me the moment he was out of the room, and do just the contrary of all I bid him, the moment I was dead.

"There is no hope of mending him; it is a sad wretch. And therefore if I should grow worse, and be weak enough of talk of seeing him, I beg, Sir, you will conclude that I doat and rave, and insist upon your promising me now that I shall not see him," which the King accordingly did. Lord Hervey was not by when all this passed, but the Duke and both the eldest Princesses were, and every one of these told it to Lord Hervey again just as I have related it. The King told it too to Lord Hervey with several other particulars and comments on the Prince's temper and vices which have already on other occasions been often mentioned in these papers.

The Queen often in her illness spoke of him, and always with detestation, and when she has heard hasty steps in the next room has said she was afraid he would watch his opportunity, come privately up the back stairs, and run into her room before anybody could stop him; and as the King and Princess Caroline both told me, the Queen

would sometimes when she talked of dying cry: "At least 1737
I shall have one comfort in having my eyes eternally
closed—I shall never see that monster again."

She certainly hated him more and expressed that hate
in stronger terms if possible in her illness than ever she had
done in health. And indeed his conduct at this time de-
served she should do so, for all this while that he was out-
wardly putting on this grief, making these professions,
sending these messages, and pretending this great desire
to see her, he was sitting in his house in Pall Mall, with
some of his trusty favourites (as I afterward learnt from
the Duke of Marlborough) railing at his mother, sending
private messages every minute to St. James's to know how
she did, and saying perpetually: "Well, sure, we must
have some good news soon. 'Tis impossible she can hold
out long. I think I am a very good son, I wish her out of
her pain." And added to speeches of this kind indecent
rejoicings, which would have shocked anybody of com-
mon humanity to hear, and could only belong to one of
the most uncommon barbarity to utter.

This whole Friday the Queen grew worse almost every
hour. The Princess Caroline went to bed at night in her
own apartment; the Princess Emily sat up in the Queen's
bedchamber; Lord Hervey lay on a couch in the next
room, and the King had his own bedding brought and
laid upon the floor in the little room behind the Queen's
dressing-room and there lay till about four o'clock on
Saturday morning, when the Queen complaining more
than ever of the racking pains she felt in her belly and of a
throbbing, he was called, and all the physicians immedi-
ately sent for, one only having been appointed to sit up,
which they did by turns during her whole illness.

When the King came into the room to the Queen he
whispered her, and, as he said afterward, told her he was
afraid her illness proceeded from a thing he had promised
never to speak of to her again; but that her life being in
danger, he could not answer it to her, himself, or his

1737 family, not to tell all he knew and all he apprehended. She begged and entreated him, with great earnestness, that he would not, and spoke with more warmth and peevishness than she showed at any other minute during her whole illness. However, he sent for Ranby the surgeon, and told him he apprehended the Queen had a rupture at her navel, and bid him examine her. The Queen carried her desire to conceal this complaint so far that when Ranby came to feel her she laid his hand on the pit of her stomach and said all her pain was there; but Ranby, slipping his hand lower, kept it there in spite of her, some little time; and then, without saying one word to the Queen, went and spoke softly to the King at the chimney, upon which the Queen started up, and sitting in her bed, said to Ranby with great eagerness: "I am sure now, you lying fool, you are telling the King I have a rupture." "I am so," said Ranby, "and there is no more time to be lost; Your Majesty has concealed it too long already; and I beg another surgeon may be called in immediately." The Queen made no answer, but lay down again, turned her head to the other side, and as the King told me, he thinks it was the only tear he saw her shed whilst she was ill. The King bid Ranby send immediately for old Busier the surgeon, whom, though four-score years old, the King and Queen had a great opinion of, and preferred to every other man of his profession.

Busier not being immediately to be found, and the King very impatient, he bid Ranby go and bring the first surgeon of any note and credit he could find; and whilst Ranby was absent on this errand, the King told Lord Hervey the whole history of this rupture.

"The first symptoms I ever perceived of it," said he, "were fourteen years ago, just after the Queen lay in of Louisa; and she then told me, when I spoke to her of it, that it was nothing more than what was common for almost every woman to have after a hard labour, or having many children. This made me easy, and it grew better,

and continued better afterwards for several years. When 1737
it grew worse again, I persuaded her to consult some surgeon, which she declined, and was so uneasy whenever I spoke to her on this subject that I knew not how to press her; but when I came from Hanover the last time but one, I found it so much worse than ever that I again spoke to her, told her it was certainly a rupture, and that she ran great risks in taking no care of it. She was so very uneasy upon my saying this, telling me it was no such thing, and that I fancied she had a nasty distemper which she was sure she had not, and spoke so much more peevishly to me on this occasion than she had ever done in her life upon any other, that upon my renewing my solicitations to her to let somebody see it, and her growing every time I mentioned it more and more hurt and angry, I at last told her I wished she might not repent her obstinacy, but promised her I never would mention this subject to her again as long as I lived."

The King, in as plain insinuations as he could without saying it in direct terms, did intimate to Lord Hervey that the Queen had received what he had said to her on this subject, upon his return from Hanover, as if she had reproached him with being grown weary of her person, and endeavouring to find blemishes in it that did not belong to her.

I do firmly believe she carried her abhorrence to being known to have a rupture so far that she would have died without declaring it, or letting it be known, had not the King told it in spite of her; and though people may think this weakness little of a piece with the greatness of the rest of her character, yet they will judge partially who interpret this delicacy to be merely an ill-timed coquetry at fifty-four that would hardly have been excusable at twenty-five. She knew better than anybody else that her power over the King was not preserved independent, as most people thought, of the charms of her person; and as her power over him was the principal object of her pursuit,

1737 she feared, very reasonably, the loss or the weakening of any tie by which she held him. Several things she afterwards said to the King in her illness, which both the King and the Princess Caroline told me again, plainly demonstrated how strongly these apprehensions of making her person distasteful to the King worked upon her.

When Ranby returned he brought one Shipton with him, a City surgeon, and one of the most eminent and most able of the whole profession. By this time, too, Busier arrived, and these three attended her constantly. After they had examined the Queen, they all told the King she was in the utmost danger. Busier proposed making the operation of cutting a hole in her navel wide enough to thrust the gut back into its place; which Ranby opposed, saying that all the guts, upon such an operation, would come out of the body in a moment into the bed, and that he thought he felt at the bottom of the swelling (which was of an immense size) a softness which he took to be a disposition to making matter and which they might encourage by warm fomentation, till the swelling might break of itself or at least allow them by a slight touch of a lancet to open it without danger. Shipton inclining to Ranby's opinion, this method was pursued.

In the meantime, Lord Hervey telling the King that he had heard it said among some lawyers that if the Queen died Richmond Gardens would come to the Prince, the King ordered Lord Hervey to go immediately to my Lord Chancellor, and ask his opinion upon it. Lord Hervey accordingly went to Westminster Hall, where my Lord Chancellor then was trying a cause in the Court of Chancery. Lord Hervey sent for him off the bench and my Lord Chancellor, stopping the proceedings, retired into a private room with Lord Hervey, and told Lord Hervey he would look into the deeds and Act of Parliament by which Richmond was settled on the Queen, and should then be able to give his opinion more particularly; but in the meantime bid Lord Hervey tell the King, whatever

the settlement was, it could not be altered by any will the Queen should make; and that whatever she died possessed of that was unsettled would go to the King if she died without a will, or even with one, if that will was not made in consequence of powers given her by His Majesty. 1737

This answer made the King easy as to everything belonging to the Queen except Richmond; and when my Lord Chancellor had examined all the settlements relating to that, it came out that Richmond would belong to the King for his life, but that after his death nothing could prevent its going to the Prince.

The King told the Queen of this transaction, to set her mind at ease from doubts she had conceived, and fears she had formed, of the Prince being any way pecuniarily the better for her death.

About six o'clock this Saturday evening the surgeons lanced the swelling just at her navel and let out some matter, but not enough to abate the swelling in any material degree or give them any great hope of her recovery.

The Princess Caroline's nose bled so violently and almost constantly this whole day that she was but little in the Queen's bedchamber, but stayed in the outward room of Her Majesty's apartment, and was again blooded with much difficulty, for Ranby was forced to prick her in both arms, and even at both the blood was so thick he could get but little.

However, her mother being so ill, no persuasions could prevail with her to go to her own side to bed; she lay all night on a couch in the outward room. Princess Emily sat up with the Queen, the King went to bed, and Lord Hervey lay on a mattress on the floor, at the foot of Princess Caroline's couch.

About four o'clock on Sunday morning the 13th, the Queen complaining that her wound was extremely painful, and desiring to have it dressed, Ranby and Shipton were called in to her, and upon opening the wound declared it

1737 had already begun to mortify. Hulse, whose turn it was that night to sit up, was sent for into the Queen's bed-chamber, and acquainted by the surgeons with the situation she was in. Hulse came to the Princess Caroline, and told her this terrible and dreaded news, upon which she bid him and Ranby go immediately and inform the King.

All this passed in the room without Lord Hervey's waking, who was fallen asleep quite exhausted by concern and watching. Princess Caroline, as soon as the surgeons and Hulse were gone to the King, waked Lord Hervey, and told him if ever he saw the Queen again it must be immediately, for that the physicians and surgeons had declared the mortification already begun, and were gone to tell the King that it was impossible for her to live many hours.

When Hulse and Ranby came back to Princess Caroline (the King being already up, and gone to the Queen), Princess Caroline and Lord Hervey asked Hulse if there was no possibility left of her recovery, and he answered: "None." Lord Hervey then asked Ranby if they were never deceived in the signs of a mortification, to which Ranby, shaking his head, replied: "We know them but too well."

The Queen finding the wound still so uneasy, sent again to have them open and dress it; but Hulse said it was to no purpose to do anything more, and Ranby assured the Princess Caroline he could do nothing that would not give the Queen more pain without a possibility of doing Her Majesty any good. However, the Queen insisting on having the wound cleaned at least, the King, who had told the Queen all that the surgeons had told him, came out, called in Ranby and Hulse, and made them comply with her request. Lord Hervey went in with them, just to see the Queen once more, looked at her through his tears for a moment, and then returned to his mattress.

As soon as the surgeons had applied some of their lenient ointments and anodyne preparations, they left the

room, came to Lord Hervey, and confirmed their former 1737 report of the impossibility of her holding out many hours.

Nobody now remained in the room with the Queen but the King, the Duke, and her four daughters, of whom she took leave in form, desiring they would not leave her till she expired. She told the King she had nothing to say to him. "For as I have always," said she, "told you my thoughts of things and people as fast as they arose, I have nothing left to communicate to you. The people I love and those I do not, the people I like and dislike, and those I would wish you to be kind to, you know as well as myself; and I am persuaded it would therefore be a useless trouble both to you and me at this time to add any particular recommendations."

To the Princess Emily she said nothing very particular; to the Princess Caroline she recommended the care of her two younger sisters, and said: "Poor Caroline, it is a fine legacy I leave you—the trouble of educating these two young things. As for you, William," continued she to the Duke, "you know I have always loved you tenderly, and placed my chief hope in you; show your gratitude to me in your behaviour to the King; be a support to your father, and double your attention to make up for the disappointment and vexation he must receive from your profligate and worthless brother. It is in you only I hope for keeping up the credit of our family when your father shall be no more. Attempt nothing ever against your brother, and endeavour to mortify him no way but by showing superior merit."

She then spoke of the different tempers and dispositions of her two youngest daughters, and the different manner in which they ought to be treated, cautioning the Princess Caroline not to let the vivacity of the Princess Louisa (the youngest) draw her into any inconveniences, and desiring her to give all the aid she could to support the meek and mild disposition of the Princess Mary.

She then took a ruby ring off her finger, which the King

1737 had given her at her coronation, and, putting it upon his, said: "This is the last thing I have to give you—naked I came to you, and naked I go from you. I had everything I ever possessed from you, and to you whatever I have I return. My will you will find a very short one; I give all I have to you." She then asked for her keys, and gave them to him.

All this and many more things of the like nature, whilst she expatiated on the several rules and instructions she gave to her children, according to their different ages, situations, and dispositions, passed in this interview, which the King and the Princess Caroline repeated to me, who told me there were during this conference no dry eyes in the room but the Queen's, who, as they could perceive, shed in all this touching scene not one tear.

It is not necessary to examine whether the Queen's reasoning was good or bad in wishing the King, in case she died, should marry again. It is certain she did wish it, had often said so when he was present, and when he was not present, and when she was in health, and gave it now as her advice to him when she was dying; upon which his sobs began to rise and his tears to fall with double vehemence. Whilst in the midst of this passion, wiping his eyes, and sobbing between every word, with much ado he got out this answer: "Non—j'aurai—des—maîtresses." To which the Queen made no other reply than: "Ah! mon Dieu! cela n'empêche pas." I know this episode will hardly be credited, but it is literally true.

When she had finished all she had to say on these subjects, she said she fancied she could sleep. The King said many kind things to her and kissed her face and her hands a hundred times; but even at this time, on her asking for her watch, which hung by the chimney, in order to give it him to take care of her seal, the natural brusquerie of his temper, even in these moments, broke out, which showed how addicted he was to snapping without being angry, and that he was often capable of using those worst whom

he loved best. For on this proposal of giving him the watch 1737 to take care of the seal with the Queen's arms, in the midst of sobs and tears he raised and quickened his voice, and said: "Ah! my God! let it alone; the Queen has always such strange fancies. Who should meddle with your seal? Is it not as safe there as in my pocket?"

The Queen after this fell into a sort of dozing, during which time the King often said: "She is dying; she will go away in this sleep; it is over; she will suffer no more." However, when she waked, she said she found herself refreshed and much better, adding: "I know it is only a reprieve to make me suffer longer, and therefore I wish it was at an end; for I cannot recover; but my nasty heart will not break yet." She then added that she believed she should not die till Wednesday, for that all the remarkable occurrences of her life had happened on that day; that she had been born on a Wednesday, married on a Wednesday, and brought to bed of her first child on a Wednesday; that she had heard the first news of the late King's death on a Wednesday, and been crowned on a Wednesday, and for this reason believed she should die of a Wednesday. This I own showed a weakness in her, but one which at this time might be excused, as most people's minds are a little weakened on these occasions, and few people, even of the strongest minds, are altogether exempt from some little taint of that weakness called superstition. Many people have more of it than they care to let others know they have, and some more of it than they know themselves.

On Sunday morning, about nine o'clock, the surgeons, *Nov. 13* upon opening the Queen's wound, found the mortification was not spread; and upon cutting off what was already mortified, declared she might recover. This appeared so inconsistent with their declarations some few hours before, and in my opinion showed so much ignorance, that if a life of this consequence, committed to the care of four of the best physicians and three of the best

1737 surgeons in England, received no better assistance from their skill, how natural it is to deplore the situation of those whose safety depends on the sagacity of these professions, and how reasonable to despise those who put their trust in such aids. Not that I am so unjust to surgery as to put that science upon the same foot with physic; and for my own part I firmly believe there was not the least mortification begun, when they ignorantly pronounced there was; and that what they cut off was not mortified, and only declared so to conceal the mistake they had made the night before in saying it was.

On Monday morning the 14th Sir Robert Walpole arrived from Houghton. The Queen had mentioned him but twice during her illness: once to say she hoped they would not send for him; and the day before he came, upon hearing he had been sent for, to ask if he was come. The King, when she asked that question, desired to know if she had anything she wanted to say to him, to which she answered: "No, nothing; my asking if he was come was mere curiosity."

Lord Hervey told the King Sir Robert was in the outward room, upon which His Majesty ordered Lord Hervey to bring him in. Sir Robert, with some difficulty from his great bulk and natural awkwardness, knelt down and kissed His Majesty's hand; but with much less difficulty (for he was at present thoroughly frightened) dropped some very proper tears and asked: "How is the Queen?" To which the King replied: "Come and see yourself, my good Sir Robert"; and then carried him to the Queen's bedside. The interview was short, but what the Queen said was material, for these were her words: "My good Sir Robert, you see me in a very indifferent situation. I have nothing to say to you, but to recommend the King, my children, and the kingdom to your care." As soon as Sir Robert came out of the room he told Lord Hervey what had passed, who asking him what he thought of the Queen, he said: "My Lord, she is as much dead as if she was in her

coffin; if ever I heard a corpse speak, it was just now in that room." He then repeated again what the Queen had said to him in the presence of the King and the Princesses, which Lord Hervey found made a great impression on his pride, whatever it did on his tenderness; for he repeated it to everybody he saw for a fortnight after. 2737

Vain of this reception and presuming upon the strength of it, he came in the evening, without being sent for, into the room where Lord Hervey used to be with the King whenever His Majesty was not with the Queen. Lord Hervey knew the King would not like this, but was afraid to tell Sir Robert so, lest Sir Robert should think him proud of an honour he was not to partake, and fool enough to be pleased with a distinction which had no other consequence than making those who thought it of more importance than he knew it was, envy, fear, and hate him; and indeed the nature of Lord Hervey's interest with the King was such as might make him many enemies but few friends; for as it was much easier to make the King hate than love, so Lord Hervey (had he been disposed to it) could with very little industry have prejudiced His Majesty against whom he thought fit, but with no pains whatever could bring him to bestow any material marks of favour on those he loved best.

When the King found Sir Robert Walpole in the evening in this room he gave him a very cold reception, and every time Sir Robert spoke and offered his advice, or told his opinion with regard to the Queen's illness, or the manner in which she was treated, His Majesty gave him very short answers, and not in the smoothest terms. The next morning, however, the King found him there again, and with him the Duke of Grafton, whom the King had not yet seen since his return from the country; he spoke very coldly to both, and going soon back to the Queen's bedchamber, he complained there that the outward room was so full of people one could not stir for them. Upon which the Princess Caroline, by the Queen's order,

1737 immediately sent to bid the room be cleared of everybody who did not use to be there; and from this time nobody attempted to come there any more.

Monday and Tuesday the Queen was what the doctors, surgeons, and courtiers called better, there being no threatening symptoms in her wound, and her vomitings being much slackened; but nothing passing through her, those who judged by essential circumstances and not on the hourly variation of trifles, whatever they might say from fashion or to please, could not in reality believe the Queen's condition more hopeful, or less dangerous, whilst that main point of the internal stoppage continued in the same situation; and whenever the King used to tell her how much better the doctors and surgeons said she was and the hopes they gave him, the moment his back was turned she used to look at the Princesses, shake her head, and bid them not flatter themselves, and often in the day used to tell them: "Believe me, my dear children, it won't do; at twenty-five I might have struggled through it, but at fifty-five I cannot resist."

During this time the Prince's family had by little and little, under the pretence first of inquiring of the Queen's health as from the Prince or Princess, and afterwards for themselves, got into possession of coming every day and all day to St. James's, till there was no part of the day in which there were not three or four of them dangling in that part of the Queen's state apartment where the Lady of the Bedchamber sat to receive all those who came to inquire about the Queen, and give the no-intelligence of the doctors' verdict on Her Majesty's situation.

This evasion of the King's order (which, though it only literally forbid those who went to the Prince's Court coming into the King's presence, was certainly meant to forbid them coming to St. James's) made the King extremely angry, and more especially because the King knew they only came to inquire if the Queen was better in hopes of hearing she was worse; and as the Queen

herself said (when she heard of their being daily and hourly there), to watch her last breath, in order to have the merit to their master of bringing the first news of her death. 1737

The King sent Lord Hervey to Sir Robert Walpole to know what way he should take to prevent these scoundrels (as he called them) coming every day to St. James's, in defiance of his order, to insult him and the Queen in their present distress. Sir Robert Walpole asked Lord Hervey what he would advise on this occasion; and Lord Hervey, who was always ready to give the Prince a slap, and knew how uneasy their coming to St. James's made the Queen, said that he thought they ought to be forbidden; but Sir Robert Walpole, who had no mind unnecessarily to shock the Prince, especially at this time, when he thought the spur that used to urge him on to those attacks was going to be blunted, told Lord Hervey that the Prince's servants would certainly pretend they came out of respect and concern for the Queen; that therefore there would be an air of hardness in forbidding them at this time, since nobody could disprove that pretended motive. He added, too, that they had not transgressed the literal sense of the order which only forbade them the King's presence; and as the King might very well be supposed to know nothing of their coming, he thought it would be better for the King just at this time not to mix any marks of resentment against his son with those of affection for his wife, nor give people a handle to say: "No situation of distress can soften him enough to make him forget to hate one moment."

This advice Lord Hervey conveyed to the King, who took it with as much reluctance as his Lordship brought it; though not with so good an excuse to himself for sacrificing his inclination to his fear, especially when he found it made the Queen so uneasy that she often asked if nobody would turn those ravens out of the house, who were only there to watch her death, and would gladly tear her to pieces whilst she was alive. "I hope, at least, it will not

1737 be thought proper to let them come into my room, if they should have a mind to it." The Queen guessed very truly the reason of their coming, for the Prince all this while used to sit up at his house in Pall Mall almost the whole night and every night, sending messengers continually to St. James's, showing the utmost impatience for their return, and saying with equal prudence and humanity to the people who were with him: "Well, sure we shall soon have good news; she cannot hold out much longer"; and talked all day long in the same strain to everybody about him. This the Duke of Marlborough told Harry Fox, and Harry Fox to Lord Hervey; and some time after the Duke of Marlborough told it to Lord Hervey himself. Poor Mr. Hamilton only, when he was told such reports were spread, doubted of the truth of them, and said the Prince was in the utmost concern for his mother; but when Lady Archibald was asked if the Prince was really concerned for the Queen, she laughed, and said: "He is very decent."

Many letters were written, and great care was taken by the Princesses, to prevent the Princess Royal making her mother's illness an excuse for coming to England at this time; everybody knowing the very indifferent reception she would meet with on her arrival from her father, who, not being apt to retain much affection for people who gave him any trouble or put him to any expense, and as little addicted to speak of them in a softer manner than he thought of them, had often lately expressed himself upon the Princess Royal's chapter in terms not altogether so paternal with regard to the affection they contained as with regard to the authority they expressed; and positive orders were sent to Horace Walpole, if persuasion failed, to stop her by force, which orders he communicated to the Prince of Orange, who immediately told them (though desired not) to his wife; the consequence of which was her venting all the passion and anger raised against those who had sent the orders on him who received them.

On Wednesday morning the Queen sent for Sir Robert 1737
Walpole, who saw her alone but not for above a quarter Nov. 16
of an hour. What really passed I know not but by conjecture, but have reason to think it was only to desire Sir Robert Walpole to examine what was to become of Richmond after her death. Sir Robert told the King this was all, and at first he told Lord Hervey so too. The King also told Lord Hervey that the Queen had told him this was all she had sent for him for. But when Sir Robert went from the Queen to the King, the King (as Sir Robert told Lord Hervey) used him worse than ever he had done in his life; and when Sir Robert told him he had been sent for by the Queen, the King forbade him going any more without first acquainting him, and said he would not have the Queen plagued now with business, adding that she was too weak to bear it, which was very true. But he himself, whenever he was in the room, was always asking her so many questions, talking so fast and in so loud a voice, and teasing her to eat and drink so many different things, that the Princesses, by Lord Hervey's advice, got the doctors to make it one of the articles in their written prescription for the Queen that she should not be talked to more than was absolutely necessary, and always in the lowest voice; and this prescription, with the rest, after it had been shown to the King, was pinned up on the curtain of the Queen's bed. But this prescription had as little effect on the King as the rest of their prescriptions had on her.

Sir Robert waited at night at St. James's till Lord Hervey came from the King, and then asked him if he could comprehend what had put the King into such a devilish humour in the morning, when the Queen was so much better. Lord Hervey said he could as little comprehend any turns in the King's temper as he could Sir Robert's giving in to the ill-founded opinion of thinking the Queen better; "for till a passage is opened," continued he, "I cannot think her vomiting a little more or a little less of any consequence, or that it signifies much that the external

1737 circumstances of her wound are something less threatening, when all the internal symptoms remain just in the same unknown and dangerous condition they were."

"Oh! my Lord," said Sir Robert, "if this woman should die, what a scene of confusion will here be! Who can tell into what hands the King will fall? Or who will have the management of him? I defy the ablest person in this kingdom to foresee what will be the consequence of this great event." "For my own part," replied Lord Hervey, "I have not the least doubt how it will be. He will cry for her for a fortnight, forget her in a month, have two or three women that he will pass his time with to lie with now and then, and to make people believe he lies with them day and night; but whilst they have most of his time, a little of his money, less of his confidence, and no power, you will have all the credit, more power than ever you had, and govern him more absolutely than ever you did. Your credit before was through the medium of the Queen, and all power through a medium must be weaker than when it operates directly. Besides, Sir, all princes must now and then be deceived by their ministers, and as the King is much easier deceived than the Queen, so your task, whenever that task is deceiving, will be much less difficult than it was before. In the first place, because the King is naturally much less suspicious than the Queen; in the next, because he is less penetrating; and lastly, because he cares much less to converse with different people, and will hear nobody talk to him of business but yourself." "Oh! my Lord," interrupted Sir Robert, "though he will hear nobody but me, you do not know how often he refuses to hear me when it is on a subject he does not like; but by the Queen I can with time fetch him round to those subjects again; she can make him do the same thing in another shape, and when I give her her lesson, can make him propose the very thing as his own opinion which a week before he had rejected as mine. The many opportunities and the credit she has with him, the knowledge of his temper, the being

constantly at him, and the opinion he has both of her judgment and her pursuit of his interest and his pleasure as her first objects, make this part easy for her; but I have not the same materials to act it, and cannot do without somebody that has leisure to operate slowly upon him, which is the only way he can be effectually operated upon. For he is neither to be persuaded nor convinced; he will do nothing to oblige anybody, nor ever own or think he has been in the wrong; and I have told the Queen a thousand times that it is not to be wondered at that he should be of that mind, when she, whom he believed sooner than any other body in the world, never heard him broach the most absurd opinion, or declare the most extravagant design, that she did not tell him he was in the right." "Notwithstanding all this," replied Lord Hervey, "I am convinced if the Queen should die (which I firmly believe she will), that you will have him faster than ever, and yet I am sincere enough to own to you I heartily wish she may recover." This conversation lasted two or three hours, and kept Lord Hervey out of bed much longer than he desired, this being the first night since the Queen was ill that he had been dismissed so early or had a prospect of passing so many hours undisturbed.

The King had been particularly anxious this whole day from what the Queen had said with regard to her dying of a Wednesday, which could not be much wondered at, since a mind much less addicted to superstition than His Majesty's might have been a little affected by a smaller hint that had fallen from one they loved in such circumstances, and on an occasion of so much importance to them. Could it then be surprising that a man who believed in ghosts and witches, should not be proof against a weakness that might have appeared in one exempt from many more than His Majesty's best friends can deny him to labour under?

On Thursday the Queen's vomitings returned with as much violence as ever, and in the afternoon one of the guts burst in such a manner that all her excrement came out

1737 of the wound in her belly, though the surgeons could not by any probing certainly tell whereabouts in the gut the fracture was. The running at the wound was in such immense quantities that it went all through the quilts of the bed and flowed all over the floor.

Some ignorant people about her who knew not from what cause this evacuation proceeded, told the Queen they hoped this relief would do her good, to which the Queen replied very calmly, she hoped so too, for that it was all the evacuations she should ever have.

Every day once at least, and sometimes oftener, from the first of her being under the surgeons' hands, they were forced, or thought themselves so, to make some new incision; and before every operation of this kind which she underwent, she always used to ask the King if he approved what the surgeons proposed to do; and when he said they had told him it was necessary, and that he hoped she would consent to anything they thought so, she always submitted immediately and with the utmost patience, resignation, and resolution suffered them to cut and probe as deep and as long as they thought fit. She asked Ranby once, whilst he was dressing her wound, if he would not be glad to be officiating in the same manner to his own old cross wife that he hated so much; and if any involuntary groans or complainings broke from her during the operations, she used immediately after to bid the surgeons not mind her, and would make them apologies for interrupting them with her silly complaints, when she knew they were doing all they could to help her.

On Wednesday some wise, some pious, and a great many busy, meddling, impertinent people about the Court asking in whispers everybody they met whether the Queen had had anybody to pray by her, and wondering at the irreligion of the Queen for thinking she could pray as well for herself as anybody could pray for her, and at those about her for not putting her in mind of so essential a duty, Sir Robert Walpole desired Princess Emily to propose to

the King or Queen that the Archbishop should be sent for, 1737 in order to stop people's impertinence upon this subject; and when the Princess Emily made some difficulty about taking upon her to make this proposal to the King or Queen, Sir Robert in the presence of a dozen people (who really wished this divine physician for the Queen's soul might be sent for, upon the foot of her salvation) very prudently added, by way of stimulating the Princess Emily: "Pray, madam, let this farce be played. The Archbishop will act it very well. You may bid him be as short as you will. It will do the Queen no hurt, no more than any good; and it will satisfy all the wise and good fools, who will call us all atheists if we don't pretend to be as great fools as they are."

After this eloquent and discreet persuasion—the whole company staring with the utmost astonishment at Sir Robert Walpole, some in admiration of his piety and others of his prudence—the Princess Emily spoke to the King, the King to the Queen, and the Archbishop was sent for, who continued afterwards to pray by her morning and evening, at which ceremony her children always assisted; but the King constantly went out of the room before his episcopal Grace was admitted. But all this was thrown away, for the people that had whispered and wondered and clamoured at no prayers were now just as busy and as whispering and as wondering about no sacrament. Some fools said the Queen had not religion enough to ask to receive the sacrament; some other fools said she had asked for it and that the Archbishop had refused to give it her unless she would first be reconciled to her son; and this many idiots believed, and many who were not idiots told, in hopes of finding credit from those that were. There were some who were impertinent enough to ask the Archbishop himself why he would not advise the Queen to be reconciled to the Prince, and more than hinted to him that he would be wanting in his duty if he did not; to which his Grace very decently and properly answered that whenever

1737 the Queen had done him the honour to talk to him upon that unhappy division in the family she had always done it with so much sense and goodness that he never thought she wanted any advice. The Queen desired the Archbishop, if she died, to take care of Dr. Butler, her Clerk of the Closet; and he was the only body I ever heard of her recommending particularly and by name all the while she was ill. Her servants in general she recommended to the King, saying in general terms he knew whom she liked and disliked, but did not, that I know of, name anybody to him in particular.

From the time of the bursting of the gut the physicians and surgeons, who had hitherto, without any disguise or reserve, talked over all the particulars of the Queen's case to anybody that asked them any questions, were absolutely forbidden by the King to reveal this circumstance, or to give any other answer for the future, to anybody whatever who inquired concerning the Queen's health, than the general one of her being much as she was. Had these restrictive orders been issued by His Majesty on the first discovery of the Queen's rupture, considering her delicacy on this point and his passion for a mystery on every point, it would have been easy to account for this edict being given out; but after her case had been talked over for five days, as publicly and as minutely as if she had been dissected before St. James's gate, I own I was at a loss to comprehend why these orders were issued, especially when this circumstance was not by the physicians or surgeons pronounced so inevitably mortal as I should have thought it natural for them to judge it. The King told it to Lord Hervey, and Ranby to Sir Robert Walpole. Lord Hervey ventured to reveal it to the Princess Caroline; but the King not telling it himself to any of his children, none of the rest of them knew it, but were extremely surprised, as well as the rest of the Court, at the sudden reserve of the physicians and surgeons in their present accounts of the Queen's situation.

During this time the King talked perpetually to Lord 1737
Hervey, the physicians and surgeons, and his children,
who were the only people he ever saw out of the Queen's
room, of the Queen's good qualities, his fondness for her,
his anxiety for her welfare, and the irreparable loss her
death would be to him; and repeated every day, and many
times in the day, all her merits in every capacity with
regard to him and every other body she had to do with.
He said she was the best wife, the best mother, the best
companion, the best friend, and the best woman that ever
was born; that she was the wisest, the most agreeable, and
the most useful body, man or woman, that he had ever been
acquainted with; that he firmly believed she never, since
he first knew her, ever thought of anything she was to do
or to say, but with the view of doing or saying it in what
manner it would be most agreeable to his pleasure, or
most serviceable for his interest; that he had never seen
her out of humour in his life; that he had passed more
hours with her than he believed any other two people in
the world had ever passed together, and that he never had
been tired in her company one minute; and that he was
sure he could have been happy with no other woman upon
earth for a wife, and that if she had not been his wife, he
had rather have had her for his mistress than any woman
he had ever been acquainted with; that he believed she
never had had a thought of people or things which she
had not communicated to him; that she had the best head,
the best heart, and the best temper that God Almighty
had ever given to any human creature, man or woman;
and that she had not only softened all his leisure hours,
but been of more use to him as a minister than any other
body had ever been to him or to any other prince; that
with a patience which he knew he was not master of, she
had listened to the nonsense of all the impertinent fools
that wanted to talk to him, and had taken all that trouble
off his hands, reporting nothing to him that was unneces-
sary or would have been tedious for him to hear, and never

1737 forgetting anything that was material, useful, or entertaining to him to know. He said that, joined to all the softness and delicacy of her own sex, she had all the personal as well as political courage of the firmest and bravest man; that not only he and her family, but the whole nation, would feel the loss of her if she died; and that, as to all the *brillant* and *enjouement* of the Court, there would be an end of it when she was gone; and that there would be no bearing a drawing-room when the only body that ever enlivened it, and one that always enlivened it, was no longer there. "Poor woman, how she always found something obliging, agreeable, and pleasing to say to everybody, and always sent people away from her better satisfied than they came! *Comme elle soutenoit sa dignité avec grace, avec politesse, avec douceur!*"

These were the terms in which he was for ever now talking of the Queen, and in which he likewise talked to her; and yet so unaccountable were the sudden sallies of his temper, and so little was he able or willing to command them, that in the midst of all this flow of tenderness he hardly ever went into her room that he did not, even in this moving situation, snub her for something or other she said or did. When her constant uneasiness, from the sickness in her stomach and the soreness of her wound, made her shift her posture every minute, he would say to her: "How the devil should you sleep, when you will never lie still a moment? You want to rest, and the doctors tell you nothing can do you so much good, and yet you are always moving about. Nobody can sleep in that manner, and that is always your way; you never take the proper method to get what you want, and then you wonder you have it not." And as the doctors said she might eat or drink anything she had a mind to or could swallow, the King was ever proposing something or other, which she never refused, though she knew it would only lie burning in her stomach for half an hour or an hour and then come up again. When she could get things down, notwith-

standing these effects (which to other people she said she 1737 knew they would have), her complaisance to him made her always swallow them; and when he thanked her for so doing, she used to answer: "It is the last service I can do you." But when her stomach recoiled so that it was impossible for her to force anything down her throat which he had given her, and that she only tasted it and gave it away, he used peevishly to say: "How is it possible you should not know whether you like a thing or not? If you do not like it, why do you call for it; and if you do, why will you give it away?" To which she would only answer: "I am very silly and very whimsical, for a *dégoût* takes me in a moment, for what I think, a minute before, I have a mind to."

Notwithstanding the constant pain she was in, and her great want of rest, the physicians never gave her opium but one night. She herself was not much inclined to take it; and the physicians, thinking it might possibly, from its binding quality, prevent the relief she so much wanted, were not very forward to prescribe it. She had not rested with it all night, and when the King came into her room in the morning, as she lay with her eyes fixed at a point in the air, as people often do in those situations, when they are neither enough at ease to shut their eyes and sleep, nor enough themselves to prevent their thoughts wandering, or to see the things they seem to look at, the King with a loud and quick voice said to her: "Mon Dieu! qu'est ce que vous regardez? Comment peut-on fixer ses yeux comme ça? Vos yeux ressemblent à ceux d'un veau à qui on vient de couper la gorge!"

There was, besides this mixture of brutality and tenderness towards the Queen, at this time in the King's conduct and conversation another mixture full as natural to him and much less extraordinary, which was the mixing constantly some praises of himself with those he bestowed on her. He never talked of her being a good wife without giving strong hints of his deserving a good one, and being

1737 at least as good a husband; and gave people to understand, when he commended her understanding, that he did not think it the worse for her having kept him company so many years. He plainly showed, too, that he not only wished other people should believe, but did himself believe that her whole behaviour to him was the natural effect of an amorous attachment to his person and an adoration of his great genius. When he mentioned his present fears for the Queen, he always interwove an account of the intrepidity with which he waited his own fate the year before, both in the storm and during his illness afterwards, giving tiresome accounts with what resolution and presence of mind he talked to his pages on shipboard during the tempest; and for a proof of his own courage, and the want of the same magnanimity in them, told us that when he saw La Chaux, one of his pages, pale and trembling in the corner of the cabin, he said to him: "Comment as tu peur?" To which La Chaux (said he) replied: "Oui, Sire, vraiment, et je crois qu'il n'y a que votre Majesté dans le vaisseau qui ne l'a pas." From which history the conclusion the King proposed one should draw was much less natural than that which most people would draw, which was that His Majesty had a mind to seem on that occasion to have more courage than he had, and that the *valet de chambre* very adroitly made his court by pretending to have less.

As to his behaviour during his illness, what fears he had I know not, but the Queen and everybody about him said he always seemed to think himself much worse than he was; and for the accounts of his peevishness and impatience, they could with great difficulty, according to his own confession, exceed reality, for he himself told me that he found such an abominable forwardness in himself that in the intermissions of it (which was not easy to catch) he had told his pages not to mind him when he was unreasonably chiding and swearing at them, for that it was part of his distemper and that he could not help it. There was

a mixture of good-nature and good sense in this apology, 1737 that I own I, who knew him, should rather have taken for an accidental distemper than the other, for it was much less of a piece with his conduct in health than what he endeavoured to excuse.

One night whilst the Queen was ill, as he was sitting in his nightgown and nightcap in a great chair, with his legs upon a stool, and nobody in the room with him but the Princess Emily, who lay upon a couch, and Lord Hervey, who sat by the fire, he talked in this strain of his own courage in the storm and his illness, till the Princess Emily, as Lord Hervey thought, fell fast asleep, whilst Lord Hervey, as tired as he was of the present conversation and this last week's watching, was left alone to act civil auditor and adroit courtier, to applaud what he heard, and every now and then to ask such proper questions as led the King into giving some more particular detail of his own magnanimity. The King, turning towards Princess Emily, and seeing her eyes shut, cried: "Poor good child! her duty, affection, and attendance on her mother have quite exhausted her spirits." And soon after he went into the Queen's room. As soon as his back was turned, Princess Emily started up, and said: "Is he gone? Jesus! How tiresome he is!" Lord Hervey, who had no mind to trust Her Royal Highness with his singing her father's praises in duetto with her, replied only: "I thought Your Royal Highness had been asleep." "No," said the Princess Emily; "I only shut my eyes that I might not join in the ennuyant conversation, and wish I could have shut my ears too. In the first place, I am sick to death of hearing of his great courage every day of my life; in the next place, one thinks now of Mama, and not of him. Who cares for his old storm? I believe, too, it is a great lie, and that he was as much afraid as I should have been, for all what he says now; and as to his not being afraid when he was ill, I know that is a lie, for I saw him, and I heard all his sighs and his groans, when he was in no more danger than I am

1737 at this moment. He was talking, too, for ever of dying, and that he was sure he should not recover." All this, considering the kind things she had heard the King say the minute before when he imagined her asleep, Lord Hervey thought a pretty extraordinary return for her to make for that paternal goodness, or would have thought it so in anybody but her; and looked upon this openness to him, whom she did not love, yet less to be accounted for, unless he could have imagined it was to draw him in to echo her, and then to relate what he said as if he had said it unaccompanied.

Whilst she was going on with the panegyric on the King which I have related, the King returned, upon which she began to rub her eyes as if she had that instant raised her head from her pillows, and said: "I have really slept very heartily. How long had Papa been out of the room?" The King, who had very little or rather no suspicion in his composition, took these appearances for realities, and said: "It is time for us all to take a little rest. We will all go to bed, for by staying here we do the poor Queen no good, and ourselves hurt." And so dismissing Lord Hervey, they all retired.

I will relate no further particulars how the two following days passed, as such a narration would be only recapitulating a diary of the two former, without any material variation. The Queen grew so perceptibly weaker every hour, that every one she lived was more than was expected.

She asked Dr. Tesier on Sunday the 20th Nov., in the evening, with no seeming impatience under any article of her present circumstances but their duration, how long he thought it was possible for all this to last. To which he answered: "Je crois que votre Majesté sera bientôt soulagée." And she calmly replied: "Tant mieux."

Nov. 20 About ten o'clock on Sunday night, the King being in bed and asleep on the floor at the feet of the Queen's bed and the Princess Emily in a couch-bed in a corner of the room, the Queen began to rattle in the throat, and

Mrs. Purcel giving the alarm that she was expiring, all 1737
in the room started up. Princess Caroline was sent for
and Lord Hervey, but before the last arrived the Queen
was just dead. All she said before she died was: "I have
now got an asthma. Open the window." Then she said:
"Pray." Upon which the Princess Emily began to read
some prayers, of which she scarce repeated ten words
before the Queen expired. The Princess Caroline held a
looking-glass to her lips, and finding there was not the
least damp upon it, cried: "'Tis over"; and said not one
word more nor shed as yet one tear on the arrival of a
misfortune the dread of which had cost her so many.

The King kissed the face and hands of the lifeless body
several times, but in a few minutes left the Queen's apart-
ment and went to that of his daughters, accompanied only
by them. Then advising them to go to bed and take care
of themselves, he went to his own side; and as soon as he
was in bed sent for Lord Hervey to come and sit by him,
where, after talking some time, and more calmly than one
could have expected, of the manner of the Queen's death,
he dismissed Lord Hervey, and sent for one of his pages
to sit up in his room all night, which order he repeated
for several days afterwards. And, by the bye, as he ordered
one of them, for some time after the death of the Queen,
to lie in his room, and that I am very sure he believed many
stories of ghosts and witches and apparitions, I take this
order (with great deference to his magnanimity on other
occasions) to have been the result of the same way of
thinking that makes many weak minds fancy themselves
more secure from any supernatural danger in the light
than in the dark, and in company than alone.

Lord Hervey went back to the Princess Caroline's
bedchamber, where he stayed till five o'clock in the morn-
ing, endeavouring to lighten her grief by indulging it,
and not by that silly way of trying to divert what cannot
be removed, or to bring comfort to such affliction as time
only can alleviate.

1737 The King passed every day and all the day (excepting the time he was at dinner, and the hour or two he slept after dinner), till the Court went into mourning, in the apartment of the Princesses, and was only called from thence for a few minutes when any of the Ministers wanted to speak with him about business, whilst every new body who was admitted to him on these occasions threw him into a new flood of tears.

The grief he felt for the Queen, as it was universally known, and showed a tenderness of which the world thought him before utterly incapable, made him for some time more popular and better spoken of than he had ever been before this incident, or than I believe he ever will be again. He was thoroughly unaffected in his conduct on this occasion, and by being so (as odd as it may seem to say this) perplexed those who were about him more to form an opinion of him than perhaps they would have been had he appeared to them in a less natural shape; for his sudden transitions from tears to smiles, from a sighing pensive silence to a loud talkative conversation on things foreign to what one imagined at other times engrossed all his thoughts; the tender manner in which he related a thousand old stories relating to his first seeing the Queen, his marriage with her, the way in which they lived at Hanover, his behaviour to her when she had the smallpox, and his risking his life by getting it of her (which he did) rather than leave her; and the next moment talking, with the most seeming indifference and calmness, of her being opened and embalmed, of the method of her ladies and maids of honour keeping watch by the body, and all the minutiae relating to the regulation of the funeral; I say his talking with so much emotion and concern of old stories, and with so little on present circumstances which affected everybody in the room but himself, and perhaps the more for their seeming to affect him so little, puzzled one's judgment of the situation of his mind extremely, and made it vary as

often as these circumstances on which it was to be formed. 1737

One day he came into the room at once weeping and laughing, and said: "Vous me croirez fou, je crois, mais je viens de voir le pauvre Horace Walpole pour la première fois, et il pleure de si mauvaise grace, qu'au milieu de mes larmes il m'a fait rire."

The King often said, and to many people at this time, that not only he and his family should have a great loss in the Queen's death, but the whole nation; and would instance occasions where he owed her good sense and good temper had kept his passions within bounds which they would otherwise have broken. And during this retirement (in which he was infinitely more talkative than I ever knew him at any other time of his whole life) he discoursed so constantly and so openly of himself that if anybody had had a mind to write the memoirs of his life from his cradle to the present moment the Princesses and Lord Hervey could have furnished them with materials of all the occurrences, transactions, and anecdotes, military, civil, amorous, foreign, and domestic, that could be comprehended in such a work, from his own lips, excepting what related to his mother, whom on no occasion I ever heard him mention, not even inadvertently or indirectly, any more than if such a person had never had a being.

He always spoke well and with respect of her father, the Duke of Zell; said that the Duke of Zell was fond of him, but had often told him, as well as he loved him, if he ever found him guilty of a base action, and that he should prove a liar or a coward, he would shoot him through the head with his own hand.

Of his aunt, the Queen of Prussia, too he spoke well, who, by what I heard from others, and particularly the Queen, was a very vain, good-for-nothing woman.

For his sister, the present Queen of Prussia, he had the contempt she deserved, and a hatred she did not deserve.

What he thought and said of the King of Prussia was

1737 much the same as what the King of Prussia thought and said of him; that he was a proud, brutal, tyrannical, wrong-headed, impracticable fellow, who loved nobody and would use everybody ill that was in his power. How far these two Kings were in the right in this point, or how little they were so in every other, is not my business here to determine.

He always spoke of his father as a weak man rather than a bad or a dishonest one; and said though his father had always hated him and used him ill, that on one point he had always done him justice, for that he knew when that scoundrel, and puppy, and knave, and rascal, my Lord Sunderland, had endeavoured to fix some lie upon him (the particulars of which story he had now forgot), that the late King had answered: "Non, non, je connois mon fils; il n'est pas menteur, il est fou, mais il est honnête homme."

Whilst the days and evenings passed in these conversations in the apartments of the Princesses, the Ministers and courtiers and politicians without doors were speculating, conjecturing, and reasoning by whom the power and credit the Queen had had was likely to be inherited.

The Dukes of Grafton and Newcastle laboured, by assuring Sir Robert Walpole it would fall upon the Princess Emily, to persuade him to play it into her hands, and by early applications there to secure her, and make her believe she owed that to his assistance, which she would certainly acquire whether he assisted her or not, and which would be employed against him, if she did not imagine in some measure she had obtained it by him. Sir Robert Walpole, in his short, coarse way, asked these Dukes, with more sense and penetration than decency or politeness: "Does your Princess Emily design to commit incest? will she go to bed with her father? or does he desire she should? If not, do not tell me the King intends to make a vow of chastity, or that those that lie with him won't have the best interest with him. I am for Madame Walmoden. I'll bring her over and I'll have nothing to do with your girls. I was

for the wife against the mistress, but I will be for the 1737
mistress against the daughter unless you think the daughter intends to behave so as to supply the place of both wife and mistress, which, as I have told you before, I know not how she can do but by going to bed with him." Accordingly he advised the King and pressed him to send for Madame Walmoden immediately from Hanover; said he must look forward for his own sake, for the sake of his family, and for the sake of all his friends, and not ruin his health by indulging vain regret and grief for what was past recall. The King listened to this way of reasoning more kindly every time it was repeated; but Sir Robert Walpole tried this manner of talking to the Princesses, not quite so judiciously, respectfully, or successfully; for when he talked to them of looking forward, drying up their tears, and endeavouring to divert their father's melancholy by bringing women about him, and in scarce covert terms persuaded them to bawd for him; when he squabbly and shockingly told them that though he had been for the Queen against my Lady Suffolk and every other woman, yet that now he would be for Madame Walmoden, and added that he would advise them in the meantime to bring my Lady Deloraine to their father for the sake of his health, saying, in his polite style, that "people must wear old gloves till they could get new ones"; when he spoke to them in this absurd style, the pride of the Princess Emily and the tenderness of the Princess Caroline were so shocked that he laid the foundation of an aversion to him in both, which I believe nobody will live to see him ever get over.

When Sir Robert Walpole advised the King to take Lady Deloraine till Madame Walmoden could be brought over His Majesty said she stank of Spanish wine so abominably of late that he could not bear her. But Lady Deloraine, who had formed to herself fine schemes of power and grandeur on being left sole possessor of the King's bed and imagined it was by the management and jealousy

1737 of the Princess Emily that she was not permitted to see the King, did in the folly of her sober hours and the extravagance of her elevated conversations break out into such invectives against Her Royal Highness, and on purpose to have them conveyed to her again, that a consultation among the Princess Emily's friends was held what was to be done with her. It was agreed and resolved that the best method the Princess could take was to act ignorance; which Lady Deloraine (who knew she could not be ignorant) construing fear, redoubled her fury, said she would go to the King whether the Princesses would or no, that Brinkman (an old *valet de chambre* of the King's) should tell her when he was alone, and that half an hour would suffice to ruin the Princess Emily (whose conduct she would lay open to her father) and to put herself in full possession of that credit which they were all afraid of and all working to prevent.

The true state of this case was that the Princesses were thoroughly indifferent whether the King saw Lady Deloraine or not and had neither tried to forward nor retard their meeting, as they did not love Lady Deloraine enough to desire to introduce her, or fear her enough to take pains to exclude her. The King, therefore, being left to himself and certainly designing to send for Madame Walmoden, as he neither cared to be at the trouble nor expense of a new mistress in the interim, soon after all this bustle saw Lady Deloraine from time to time as he had done before the Queen's death without the least alteration in his manner of talking to her or his manner of paying her, and in short sent for this old acquaintance to his apartment from just the same motives that people send casually for a new one to a tavern.

Lord Hervey, whilst all the world was speaking of him at this time as the King's first favourite, knew his own situation too well to think the interest he had in His Majesty worth anything to one whose vanity could not be pleased with the *éclat* of appearances, when he knew

there was nothing essential to be depended upon at the 1737
bottom. The letter he wrote at this time to Sir Robert
Walpole will explain his own sentiments of his present
situation so well, that I need add nothing by way of com-
ment to the following copy of it.

Lord Hervey to Sir Robert Walpole.

DECEMBER 1, 1737.

SIR,

As I never did nor ever will deceive you by misrepresenting or
concealing my thoughts upon any occasion, so I cannot resist
troubling you with them upon this, and choose to do it in writing,
not only as the surest way of not being prevented in the attempt, but
because you should not imagine, what often happens in speaking, that
they are sudden starts and not my coolest sentiments and reflections.

That you have had a very sensible and affecting loss is certain;
the loss of a great, a good, a wise, a kind, and a powerful friend must
ever be esteemed such; but as to the loss it will be in points where
people who look from a great distance, and consequently see imper-
fectly, imagine it will hurt you, you know I told you before this
unfortunate event, and I am every hour more confirmed in that
opinion, that it will be far from affecting you as some of your san-
guine enemies hope, or some of your misjudging friends may appre-
hend. It may occasion many difficulties in the exercise of your power,
but no danger to the possession of it. I need not expatiate on all the
particular reasons on which this opinion is founded; you would not
like I should, and I have already in conversation told you two which
alone would be sufficient to demonstrate the truth of it, and these
are, the Queen's recommendations of you, and the King's desire to
refute the insinuations frequently made when she was living, that
you were her minister, not his, and forced upon him by her influ-
ence, not distinguished by his choice.

This being the case, you are as secure as ever, perhaps more so,
and you know I have my reasons, and good ones, for saying so; but,
indeed, I have often said of you, though never before to you, what
I really think true, that your great talents and abilities are so much
superior to anybody I ever knew, or I believe ever shall know, that
the loss of them is the only essential loss in the ministerial character
you can ever feel, and that whilst you keep them you may meet with
rubs, but you will never find a stop.

As to my own situation (it is the last time I will trouble you upon
it, so bear with me), it is as well known to me as yours. I have long

1737 made it my sole business to please the Queen and you. How well or how ill I succeeded in the first is now immaterial; but that I have on every occasion endeavoured to gain your friendship and on some lately to move your good-nature, and have succeeded alike in both, is, I fear, too true. Some honorary trifles you have refused me, and other more essential favours which you have denied, leave me too little room to doubt that either those who have always been giving you ill impressions of me have made you afraid or unwilling to distinguish me, or that your own judgment and knowledge of me have convinced you that I am fit for nothing but to carry candles and set chairs all my life, and that I am sufficiently raised, at forty years old, by being promoted to the employment of Tom Coke and designed, like him, and on the same terms, to die in it. My situation often puts me in mind of three lines in Dryden, where a Prince, speaking of a very contemptible appurtenance to his Court, says—

The Court received him first for charity,
And since with no degree of honour graced,
But only suffer'd where he first was plac'd.

I promised you I never would ask anything for myself of the Queen but through you, and kept my word; but I own to you I feel my pride so shocked by many things that have happened to me of late, that nothing but my not being able to afford to quit has prevented me. Not that in quitting I should have acted in anything differently from what I have done and shall now do, but would that way only have endeavoured to make you regret the slighting me for the sake of others, whom I wish you may always find deserve as well of you. I once had it in my power to serve you (or my vanity gave me the pleasure of thinking so). That time is over. I know I am now as insignificant as any other of the dignified ciphers about you—as insignificant as their envy can wish me or as anything can make me. For as for the little distinctions the King has shown me during the poor Queen's illness or since her death, they are such as may serve for food to the envy of some fools of our acquaintance, but are not what I am fool enough, I promise you, to think of more value in point of an interest than the sheet of paper I am writing upon. But my interest at Court might have been, though like this paper, of some consequence to me, since you might have written what you pleased upon it, though you have thought fit to leave it a blank.

You will be tired of reading, and I am tired of writing. Do not torture any expression in this letter, for I am not in a situation of mind to weigh or choose my words, and all I mean to say is that I will be refused or disappointed no more, for I will ask and expect

no more; that my enemies shall not conquer, for I will not struggle; 1737
that I could have made my peace with my greatest enemy if I would
have done it at your expense; that I scorned it, and do not repent
the part I have acted; that I submit to be a nothing, and wish who-
ever you honour with your confidence, or benefit with your favour,
may always serve you with as honest a mind, as warm a heart, and as
unshakable an attachment, as you have been served by your neg-
lected, etc.

To this letter Sir Robert Walpole sent no answer in writing, but by a verbal message desired to speak with Lord Hervey early the next morning, and then told him, with a very well acted concern, that of all the things he had ever met with in business, this letter had surprised and afflicted him the most; that after his own children there was nobody in England he loved so well, nor anybody to whom he thought he had done more obligations than to Lord Hervey. "As to the opinion I have of your worth and integrity, my Lord, the things with which I have trusted you are a sufficient proof. I mean to serve you, I wish to please you, for God's sake go on with me as you used to do; and leave it to me, pray trust me to show the sincerity with which I speak to you. Let us have no *éclaircissemens* on what is past; commit your future interest to my care, and give me leave to think, what I wish to believe, that all the dissatisfaction expressed in your letter is rather the effect of the melancholy present turn of your mind on this unhappy event, than a distrust of my friendship and sincerity."

It would be very tedious to relate all the particulars of this long conversation, which ended in an extorted promise from Lord Hervey that he would not alter his conduct, make any complaints to anybody, or relate what had passed between them, unless he thought he had any fresh reason to be displeased with Sir Robert Walpole's behaviour; and though Lord Hervey now began to know Sir Robert Walpole too well to depend much on the most lavish professions of kindness and esteem, yet he had some

1737 satisfaction in Sir Robert Walpole's behaving in a manner that saved him the trouble of coming to a rupture with him at a time when it was certainly his interest as well as his inclination to lie by and be quiet. It will be natural, then, to ask, if these were Lord Hervey's sentiments, why he wrote this letter. The answer to which is that he thought the letting Sir Robert Walpole see he was sensible he had not been well used was the likeliest way to prevent his being worse used, knowing that fear was the only check upon a man who was so apt to conceive jealousies and suspicions, and whose temper, though it could from that motive of fear long suspend resenting, seldom or never failed from any other to annoy and depress those against whom these jealousies and suspicions were conceived.

Several of Sir Robert Walpole's enemies, as well as some of Lord Hervey's injudicious friends, tried to stimulate and persuade Lord Hervey at this time to endeavour to ruin Sir Robert Walpole in the palace, to make use of his perpetual access to the King to this purpose, and told him, as the Princesses were so irritated against Sir Robert, from his ungrateful behaviour to their mother's memory and his indecent conduct towards themselves, that they would certainly join with Lord Hervey in promoting any scheme that tended to the subversion of his power and the punishment of his insolence; at the same time blowing up Lord Hervey's vanity and ambition, by telling him how capable he was of stepping into Sir Robert's place, and how glad the at present broken Whig party would be to unite under his banner, if he would but set up his standard. But these people know little of the true situation of things; the Princess Emily not daring to speak of business to the King, and the Princess Caroline not caring how things went, engrossed by her melancholy, and in so bad a state of health, that nobody imagined, any more than herself, that her life would be of any long continuance.

APPENDIX I

Notes and Letters by Lord Hervey relating to Cabinet meetings in 1740 and his dismissal in 1742.

List of the Cabinet Council, April 28, 1740.

- POTTER, Archbishop of Canterbury. 1740
Lord HARDWICKE, Lord Chancellor.
Earl of WILMINGTON, Lord President of the Council.
Lord HERVEY, Lord Privy Seal.
Duke of DORSET, Lord Steward.
Duke of GRAFTON, Lord Chamberlain.
Duke of RICHMOND, Master of the Horse.
Duke of DEVONSHIRE, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.
Duke of NEWCASTLE, Secretary of State.
Earl of PEMBROKE, Groom of the Stole.
Earl of ISLA, as First Minister for Scotland.
Lord HARRINGTON, Secretary of State.
Sir ROBERT WALPOLE, Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Sir CHARLES WAGER, First Commissioner of the Admiralty.
(Sir JOHN NORRIS,¹ called in as an auxiliary when anything was under deliberation relative to our present maritime war with Spain.)
May 7. The Duke of MONTAGU, made Master of the Ordnance in place of the Duke of ARGYLL, became of course one of the Cabinet Council.
May 8. The Duke of BOLTON, without a right to it from his office of Captain of the Band of Pensioners, in which employment he succeeded the Duke of MONTAGU on his removal to the Ordnance, was likewise admitted of the Cabinet Council, because he had been of it seven years ago, at the time he was turned out of all his employments.

¹A distinguished officer: he had been many years a Lord of the Admiralty, was now Admiral of the Fleet, and was appointed in the summer to the command of the Channel Fleet.—*Croker*.

With Mr. Haddock in the Mediterranean, 32 ships,—22 of the line, 5 twenty-gun ships, 3 fire-ships, 2 bomb-vessels. All these are at present with Haddock to defend Minorca, except four left at Gibraltar with Captain William Hervey, brother to Lord Hervey, which properly belong to [Sir Challoner] Ogle's squadron of 10, who went with the other 6 to join Haddock.

Balchen and Maine had 10, to cruise on the north-west of Spain, near Cape Finisterre and Ferrol; but Maine's 5 are returning home to refit.

At home there are 30 ships for the Channel, to guard our own coasts and protect this country; but 20 only being manned, one-third of the nominal strength is absolutely useless.

In the West Indies there are now with Vernon 9 ships of the line, 5 fire-ships, and 2 bomb-vessels; and dispersed in the West Indies about 16 ships more of different sizes.

Spanish Strength in Europe.

At Carthagena 5 ships of the line, commanded by Clavijo, who commanded the Cales [Cadiz] squadron last year. The Cales squadron, 9 ships of the line, 3 frigates, commanded by Pintada. The Ferrol squadron, 6 ships of the line, and the 3 Assogue ships¹ refitting, and 16,000 men in Galicia.

On the Catalonia side of Spain several transport ships, 3 men of war, 7,000 men in Majorca; and another body of troops, commanded by Count Clemis, in Catalonia, ready for an embarkation at Barcelona, which Spain dare not hazard for fear of Haddock's squadron ready in those seas to intercept them. Their strength, or rather their weakness in Spain, uncertain.

French Strength in Europe.

France has at Brest, ready to sail, commanded by Mons. D'Antin, a squadron of 22 ships; the lowest accounts say 18; and at Toulon 12, all great ships from 54 to 74 guns.

¹The *Azogue* (quicksilver) ships, which plied annually between Vera Cruz and Cadiz, and the interception of which had been an early object of the British Government; but, having heard of the hostilities, they left their usual track, made the coast of Ireland, and thence ran down the coast of France, and got safe into Santander.—*Croker*.

*Minutes of what passed in the Cabines Council from the time 1740
the King made Lord Hervey Keeper of his Privy Seal,
April 23, 1740.*

Monday, April 28, 1740, 8 at night, at the Cockpit.

Two letters were produced by Sir Charles Wager and read; the first importing that the Cales squadron of nine ships of the line, and three frigates (believed before to have sailed to America), were now thought to be gone to Ferrol, to join a squadron there of six men-of-war, already fit to put to sea, and three more, which were the Assogue ships, refitting for that purpose. The second letter, of a later date, confirmed this news of the junction of these two Spanish squadrons; both letters what they call ship-news.

Upon this the Duke of Newcastle proposed to Sir Charles Wager to send orders to Admiral Haddock (now lying with part of his squadron, 19 ships of the line, besides some smaller vessels, in the Mediterranean to defend Minorca against the attempts expected to be made by Spain by an embarkation from Barcelona) not to send the ten ships which he had been ordered about a fortnight ago to send to America, because (says his Grace) you know as soon as those first orders were gone we changed our minds, and thought it better to send ten ships from hence to America, to reinforce Vernon, and prevent the ill effects of the Cales squadron arriving there; but as on changing our minds we forgot to change the first orders to Haddock, if we do not send soon, those orders will be followed, and instead of ten ships being sent to America, twenty will go, ten from hence and ten from Haddock. Sir Charles Wager muttered something in answer to this, most of it so inarticulately, that it seemed like sounds without words, and where the articulation was plain it seemed words without sense. Then he gave another letter to be read, from a captain of a ship ordered to cruise off Cape St. Mary's, in which the captain said he could neither sleep day nor night for fear of finding what he was ordered to search for; since he had been forced to leave fifty men sick at Gibraltar, that he wanted originally thirty-eight of his complement, and had besides thirty sick in bed on board; so that he was so far from being in a fighting condition, that he had hardly hands to work his ship.

Then it was proposed to send to Balchen (who was to have scoured the seas on the coast of Spain from Lisbon northward) to keep out of the way of the enemy, for fear of being destroyed by this junction of the Cales and Ferrol squadrons; but no orders were given upon this, any more than the counter orders to Haddock relating to the ten ships.

1740 After this the Duke of Newcastle produced a copy of the speech the King was to make next day to both Houses of Parliament upon putting an end to the Session. There were several wise dissertations held on verbal alterations, all of them equally important with the two I am going to mention; which were, first, whether the King should say I have *frequently* or *formerly* recommended to you union and unanimity among yourselves, etc.; secondly, whether he should say *my* enemies or *our* enemies. On each of these material disputes were wasted at least twenty minutes, and as many hundred words, among which were those by which his Grace of Richmond showed in this debate that he thought himself no incompetent judge of style.

At the end of the Speech there was a paragraph, originally inserted to notify the King's wise, brave, and prudent resolution of going this summer to Hanover; but as Sir Robert Walpole did not yet totally despair of something possibly happening that might hinder this monstrous intention, he had prevailed with the King to leave it out, by telling him it was more for his grandeur to go without telling his Parliament, or to make people believe it was some sudden resolution taken when he did go, on some occasion or occurrence he had not foreseen. When the Duke of Newcastle came to this paragraph (which was the last), he stopped short, said nothing of it, but turned and whispered my Lord Chancellor for some time, then looked notable and said to him aloud: "You take me." My Lord Chancellor looked wise, took snuff, nodded, and then dropped his head on his left shoulder, but made not one word of answer. The rest of the Lords of the Council looked at one another with joint admiration at his Grace of Newcastle's giving them this proof both of his good breeding and his good sense; in the first place for showing he would not trust them with part of the Speech, and in the next for seeming to make a mystery of that which every one at the table knew, all of them three days, and some of them above three weeks; and for myself, I knew of it before he did.

Tuesday at noon, April 29, at St. James's.

The Speech read before the King. I was absent.

Wednesday at noon, April 30, at St. James's.

Report on the malefactors.¹ I was absent.

¹Recorder's report.

Orders sent to Balchen to return home with his five ships, to secure himself from being attacked where he was by a superior force from Ferrol, and to guard the Channel.

Monday, May 5, at night, at the Cockpit.

There is a treaty subsisting between England and Denmark, by which the latter is obliged to furnish 6,000 men to the former for a subsidy of £52,000 per annum. This treaty was made for three years. One year and a half is expired, and by good intelligence we know that France has engaged Denmark, at the expiration of our term of three years, to let these troops to her.

The question in Council was whether we should stop the payment immediately of the subsidy to Denmark on this intelligence, half a year being now due to Denmark; and whether it was not absurd for us to pay troops for another year and a half, which we knew, after that time was expired, would be engaged against us? The difficulty was this: if we stopped the English payment, without being able to prove the French treaty, we should lie under the imputation of having broke the treaty; and if Denmark has entered into this reversionary treaty with France, in reality she has broken the treaty first, because there is an article in our treaty with Denmark that says both parties shall keep themselves at liberty, till within three months of its expiration, to renew it; and if Denmark has promised these troops to France at the end of our term of three years, she has broken that article of the treaty, because she is no longer at liberty to renew this treaty. Before payment of this last half-year should be made, therefore, and on the intelligence of this treaty with France, Lord Harrington had been ordered to write to the Court of Denmark, to know if the King had begun *or* concluded any such treaty; to which he had received this evasive answer, that His Danish Majesty had not begun *and* concluded any treaty with France for these troops; by which answer Denmark hoped to get the money due from England without telling a flat lie, or revealing the truth, which was, that such an engagement was entered into between France and Denmark for the reversion of these troops, as was understood on both sides, though no direct treaty was concluded in the common forms. Lord Harrington, therefore, had been ordered to write again, for a more explicit answer, to know whether any negotiation was on foot between Denmark and France for these troops; and when the Danish minister pressed, as he did, every day for the payment of the

1740 half-year now due, it was agreed in Council that the answer should be, that it could not be paid till we received an answer from the Court of Denmark to Lord Harrington's last letter: whilst His Danish Majesty, by a very odd-turned conscience, seemed to scruple telling a direct falsehood by his Ministers in a letter, at the same time that he had not scrupled acting one, by breaking an essential article of a treaty he had signed.

Sir Robert Walpole then acquainted the Lords of the Council, that the King had received an offer from the King of Sweden, as Landgrave of Hesse,¹ to let His Majesty have 6,000 Hessians, but required an immediate answer. Sir Robert Walpole was clear, he said, in his opinion, that since Sweden was our avowed enemy, Denmark no longer our friend, and Russia upon the point of being reconciled to Sweden, that we ought to accept this offer made by the King of Sweden, partly to thwart the views of the present reigning party in the Swedish senate, who have reduced him to an absolute cipher in the state; and partly induced by the ties of this new alliance of his heir and nephew, Prince William of Hesse, with the Princess Mary of England, now on the point of being married. The whole Council unanimously agreed with Sir Robert Walpole, that the King should be advised to close with this proposal of the King of Sweden without loss of time.

After this came on several questions relating to the marriage of the Princess Mary, which the King had ordered for next Thursday, though it was not yet known nor determined whether she was to be married or only contracted, nor whether the Archbishop, as head of ecclesiastical affairs, or the Bishop of London, as Dean of the Royal Chapel of St. James's, where the ceremony (whatever it was) was to be performed, should officiate. Both these prelates claimed the honour of officiating, and had produced a great deal of Church-learned rubbish to support their pretensions. The Duke of Newcastle, the Duke of Grafton, and Duke of Dorset were for the Bishop of London; and Sir Robert Walpole for the Archbishop. All this had been talked over in private, and Sir Robert Walpole told me it was very hard and very disagreeable, that whenever anybody had been impertinent to him, those who ought to be his friends were always ready to support such people in any dispute they had, and that his being against any one was enough to make others partial to them. I told him, since both these troublesome persons submitted

¹Frederick, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, married Ulrica, sister and successor of Charles XII., and in right of her was declared King of Sweden in 1720.—*Croker*.

to the King's decision, the short question was whether he should 1740
advise the King to please one he could not oblige, or oblige one
whom, since he was Archbishop, it was his interest to please, and
whom he might make his tool, if not his friend.

The other difficulty, whether the Princess should be married or
only contracted by solemn espousals, arose thus. The King long
ago determined that Prince Frederick should not come over to
marry his daughter, because he would not be at the expense of it;
and now he was as peremptory in saying his daughter should be
married before she went, because it was below his dignity to send
his daughter to a man who, when she came to him, had it in his
power to call her his wife or not. The ecclesiastics first started the
objection to the Princess being married by proxy, saying there was
no precedent for it since the Reformation; but as ecclesiastics,
where they give up no power or profit, are not addicted to being very
stiff in their opposition to the will of a Court, this difficulty was soon
got over; when another arose from the lawyers, who said, if the
Princess was married here only by proxy, it would call in question
the right of her descendants to this Crown, if ever the right should
devolve there; and more remote branches had, by the extinction of
others, often come to such right. For the Act of Succession that
settles the Crown on this family, in order to secure the Protestant
religion, according to the established Church of England (to protect
which this family was introduced here), does say that all the marri-
ages of the Royal family performed in England shall be according
to the form of the Church of England; and for this form, by the
Act of Uniformity of the 13th and 14th Charles II., the Common
Prayer-Book is referred to, and the Service for Matrimony, as well
as all others, must be performed in the words as they stand in that
book; which could not be if the Princess was married by proxy only,
many words in that form being to be altered for a marriage by proxy.

All this Sir Robert Walpole told to the King, whom he could
not make comprehend it, and told all the Lords of the Cabinet
Council, with more sincerity than prudence, that the King had said
to him that morning: "I will hear no more of your Church non-
sense, nor of your law nonsense—I will have my daughter married
here, and will have the marriage complete"; all which His Majesty
persisted in, not only against the evident words of the Acts of Suc-
cession and Uniformity, which would have illegitimated his daugh-
ter's posterity with regard to the inheritance of this Crown, but
even against the previous articles of marriage which he had signed,
and pursuant to which the powers sent to the Duke [of Cumberland],

1740 the Prince of Hesse's procurator, were drawn; those powers going no further than an authority for solemn espousals here, in order to her being married when she came to Hesse-Cassel.

At last it was agreed in Council to represent to the King, that the precedent of the Princess Mary, Henry VII.'s daughter's espousals here, and marriage afterwards in France to the King of France, was the only precedent in this case (as things now stood) which could be followed; and His Majesty's impatience to go to Hanover, and to hear of no more difficulties, together with the reflection that his daughter, without lessening his dignity, might do what the daughter of Henry VII. did, got the better of his usual inflexibility; and he consented that this precedent should be followed, which may be seen in Rymer's 'Fœdera,' vol. xiii, p. 432. This precedent too, it is said in the Cabinet, avoided a decision in the dispute between the Archbishop and the Bishop of London, since a Secretary of State, and not an ecclesiastic, would be to officiate at the ceremony of these espousals in the Chapel; but as the Archbishop, at the end of the ceremony, was to pronounce the benediction and to bless the nuptials, after making a Latin speech, I think it did manifestly decide the episcopal dispute, and in favour of the Archbishop; but his Grace fearing other people might not be as clearly of my opinion, took care to engraft some *hors d'œuvre* prayers in the ceremony to put it out of dispute, and wisely chose for one of those prayers, to open the whole nuptial ceremony, that which begins thus,—“Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings.”¹ The Bishop of London was absent.

Tuesday, May 6, at night, at the Cockpit.

My Lord Harrington said he had spoke that morning with the King of Sweden's minister about the treaty for the 6,000 Hessians, and that he insisted on all the levy-money, if the treaty was only for three years, but would be contented with half (as proposed) if it was for four.

That he would have an article to stipulate that these troops should not be employed against Sweden, or any of the provinces belonging to Sweden.

These articles were agreed to in gross; but I proposed that when the sense of the last came to be reduced to words, it might run, that these troops should not be employed to *attack* Sweden, or any of the provinces, etc. For otherwise, if, on peace being made between

¹The whole detail of the ceremonies, prayers, and speech (in Latin and in English), are to be found in the *London Magazine* for May, 1740.—*Craker*.

Sweden and Russia, the reigning party in Sweden should, to maintain their power at home, by some popular act, attack Bremen and Verdun, under the pretence of recovering the dismembered parts of their monarchy; the King of England, by a looser way of wording this stipulation, would be precluded from calling for these Hessians to defend their places *so attacked*, which would defeat what, we all knew, was the sole view in taking them into our pay.

Most of the Lords seemed to stare and wonder at my speaking so plain; but I insisted on the word *attack* being in this clause of the treaty; and when Sir Robert Walpole gave his opinion that it should be so, all the mutes and starers at once said, "To be sure, to be sure; these sort of things can never be made too plain."

After this the Duke of Newcastle read several letters from Lord Waldegrave, in which his Lordship said that they knew nothing in France yet, whether the Cales squadron and the Ferrol squadron were joined, where either of them was, or for what they were designed. From which his Grace inferred, contrary to all other intelligence, and the probability from all other circumstances, as well as the opinion of Sir Charles Wager, Sir John Norris, and Sir Robert Walpole, that they were not joined. Sir Robert Walpole said, very sensibly and reasonably, that though he did not pretend to say how these fleets would be employed upon their union, yet he made no doubt of their being united; for as they had been hitherto useless from their being separate, it must have been in common sense the policy of Spain, as soon as she could, to unite them; and afterwards to determine whether they should be employed in an invasion of England or Ireland, or to prevent the expedition of Lord Cathcart, ready now to sail with the new-raised marines to the West Indies; or make the best of their way immediately to America, to attack our settlements there, or find out Vernon,¹ and concluded with saying, that if they should be joined by the Brest squadron, and make any attempt here, that we had not a naval force to resist them; for as we wanted a third of our complement of seamen, so, though we had thirty ships at home, we could have the use only of twenty. "Therefore, Sir Charles and Sir John, I must (says he) again add, what has been the burden of my song in every Council these four months—Oh! seamen, seamen, seamen!"

I must here add too, that most people in Council thought (that is, of those few who ever thought) that Lord Waldegrave's letters

¹Admiral Vernon, who had become so popular by the taking of Porto Bello at the close of the preceding year, was now threatening other portions of the Spanish Main.—*Croker*.

1740 did not prove the present ignorance of France with regard to the situation of the Spanish affairs, which the Duke of Newcastle read them to prove; but manifested rather his Lordship's own ignorance, proceeding either from very bad intelligence, or from the care the Cardinal took to let him know nothing he could hide from him, or both; which extreme caution and secrecy in the Cardinal must naturally make one suspect and conclude that France has now some material measure under deliberation, which we must every day expect should break out. But as they know now in France of the King's prudent intention of going this summer to Hanover, in all probability they will not strike the meditated blow till he leaves England; judging his absence the most favourable opportunity to molest those whom he seems to think it so little his business to guard and protect, and whose resentment for such usage may produce such discontents at home as will facilitate the success of any attempts from abroad.

After the Council had treated this subject speculatively for about an hour and a half, without doing anything, and stated the dangers which they took no care to provide against and avert, the Duke of Newcastle renewed the *vieillerie* of asking their Lordships when they would think fit to advise the King to send the counter orders to Haddock relating to the ten ships, and what further orders should be given relating to his conduct and Ogle's; and as his Grace never omitted any opportunity to exhibit his own works to their Lordships' perusal, and consequently, as he thought, to their admiration of his parts and style, he begged leave again to read, what he had already read so often, that the worst memory at the Board must have got by heart, which was that letter of his, that conveyed those orders which were now to be revoked. This letter gave Haddock orders to detach Ogle immediately from his squadron with ten ships, and to give him discretionary and eventual orders, when he arrived before Cales, to follow the Cales squadron if he heard it was gone to America; to Ferrol, if he was informed it was there; and if by intelligence he learned that it was sailed towards England or Ireland, to make the best of his way home.

After this letter was read, a long, total, and profound silence ensued, which I broke by asking the date of this letter; and his Grace of Newcastle saying it was dated April 18th, I begged leave to observe, that counter orders now to Haddock could be of no use, since his part in detaching the ten ships must necessarily be already executed; and that what orders were now to be given should be sent to Ogle, who in all probability was at this time coming or was

already come to Ferrol; where, with ten ships only, he was certainly outnumbered by the Spanish squadrons, since they were joined, and run great risk of being overpowered by them. His Grace to this answered, with retrospective wisdom (the easiest of all wisdom, and consequently the only wisdom he could have the appearance of possessing): "Aye, these are our difficulties, and brought upon us by the fatal steps of Ogle leaving Cales, and Maine coming home with his five ships, and leaving Balchen, whom for these reasons we have been forced to recall too." Upon which Sir Robert Walpole interrupted him, and said: "For God's sake, my Lord, let us do the best we can ourselves, and leave off arraigning and condemning the conduct of those to whom the care of this country is committed, who are employed and trusted by the Crown, and who do the best they can; who, as the best judgments are fallible, may have misjudged; but who, as they are better informed than we are, at present, of all the circumstances that were to determine their judgments, may have judged better of what was to be done in the situation they then were, than we now judge of them; let us look forward, let us do our best in ordering, and conclude, since nobody doubts of these officers meaning well, that they do their best in executing." His Grace upon this was angry and silent; two things he had always better join, though he seldom did. After two hours' more talking on these subjects and little to the purpose, it was agreed that no further orders should be sent either to Haddock or Ogle, till we could learn with more certainty the motions and designs of the Spanish fleet, and the intentions of France.

That something of moment was now under deliberation in France was probable from the great caution used in every thing that was said there by the Cardinal to Lord Waldegrave, as well as from the improbable ignorance he affected of some circumstances upon which he did not care to talk at all. But Lord Harrington in my ear, after the Council was broke up, told me a thing he had learned by letters from Holland, which was a still stronger indication of some negotiation of great importance being now in agitation between France and Spain; which was that it was a certain fact that three couriers from France arrived lately at Madrid in the compass of four days; which fact Lord Harrington learned from the Pensionary in Holland, who at this time gave us intelligence of all that passed at the Court of Madrid, which Vandermeer, the Dutch minister there, could get to the knowledge of.

Just as Sir Robert Walpole was upon his legs to go away, the Duke of Newcastle said: "If you please, I would speak one

1740 word to you before you go"; to which Sir Robert Walpole replied: "I do not please, my Lord, but if you will, you must."—"Sir, I shall not trouble you long."—"Well, my Lord, that's something; but I had rather not be troubled at all: won't it keep cold till to-morrow?"—"Perhaps not, Sir."—"Well, come then, let's have it,"—upon which they retired to a corner of the room—where his Grace whispered very softly, and Sir Robert answered nothing but aloud, and said nothing aloud, but every now and then, "Pooh!—Pshaw!—O Lord! O Lord!—Pray be quiet.—My God, can't you see it is over?" This secret was, that Lord Pembroke had proposed privately that all the Lords of the Cabinet should join in remonstrating against the King's journey to Hanover; which Sir Robert Walpole said would now have no other consequences than irritating and provoking the King in private, and loading him more in public; two things that wanted no additional weight to strengthen them, but rather all our care to soften them.

Thursday evening at 7, at the Cockpit.

May 22, 1740. The King waiting for a wind at Sheerness.

The Duke of Newcastle read all the letters received from Lord Waldegrave since the last meeting of the Cabinet Council; which contained, first an account of the Spanish fleet having gained a complete victory over Balchen and his five ships, and the general joy there was in France at Court and at Paris on the arrival of this news. The next letters contradicted the report of this engagement, but confirmed the part France took in inclination, though not in fact, in the interest of Spain against England, by saying the melancholy on the news of this Spanish victory being contradicted, was as manifest as the joy on the belief of it.

Another letter from Lord Waldegrave said that Monsieur D'Antin had received orders to repair immediately to his command of the Brest squadron, which was forthwith to sail, and it was thought to the Baltic.

His next letter contradicted this account too, and said Monsieur D'Antin's departure from Paris was suspended.

In this he gave an account of some disputes too between the Courts of Madrid and Versailles, relating to their treaty of commerce, and that each was much dissatisfied with the conduct of the other—an intelligence, I fear, as little to be depended upon as the rest.

Another letter gave an account, new to Lord Waldegrave, 1740 though very stale here, of the junction of the Cales and Ferrol squadrons.

Letters from Italy were read, relating the return of the Pretender's eldest son from Civita Vecchia to Albano, the Pretender's hunting-seat near Rome: and informing us that nobody paid the Pretender and his sons greater distinctions than the Prince of Craon, the great Duke's master of the horse, and sole director of his affairs in Tuscany, who was now at Rome.

It was resolved in Council to write to Mr. Robinson, the English minister at Vienna, not to make a formal complaint at that Court of this conduct of the Prince of Craon, but to give intimations of its being known here, and not well taken.

Letters from Holland said that Vandermeer had acquainted the Pensionary that the Duke of Ormond had been ordered to set out forthwith from Madrid to take the command of the troops in Galicia, but that he had refused to go till the arrears due to him were paid to defray the expense he must be at in this journey, and till some scheme was set on foot for the payment of the troops he was to command, as well as for their subsistence, which was now so scanty, that it was thought another month's sojourning there would starve them.

After this the two questions were again debated, which had been so often started, relating to the manning of the fleet, and the orders that should be sent to Ogle what he was to do with the ten ships under his command, that had been detached by the orders of the 18th of April from Haddock's squadron.

With regard to the first, Sir Robert Walpole said it was the most necessary point of all to be considered, as the deficiency of men was so great, and the recruits made by the present method of pressing so slow and so few, that a third part of our ships at home were absolutely useless for want of men only; and that all the new men we now get, hardly answered the numbers that died or fell sick. His proposal, therefore, was to withdraw, or rather to overrule, all protections now standing out, to despise the clamour there would be on this occasion, and not to be courting popularity when this island was at stake; but to apply ourselves in the first place to the view of its defence, exclusive of all others. He said, by the junction of the two squadrons, that the Spaniards had now a naval strength at Ferrol equal to England; and if the Brest squadron should join them, greatly superior; and as he did not doubt but that our present situation was as well known to France as to ourselves, he feared,

1740 notwithstanding the pacific disposition of the Cardinal, that this temptation of being able to distress us with so little risk to France, might induce him to take that part, which every man in France, but himself, had long wished might be taken.

Sir John Norris said, he feared this method proposed by Sir Robert Walpole, of getting seamen by overruling the protections, would be too slow to serve our present purpose and answer the immediate exigency; and said he had prepared a scheme for manning seventeen of the home ships for instant service, by putting two battalions of foot on board them, joined to a draught of 1,800 men out of the body of marines, which would come to 3,000 men; and as these seventeen ships wanted only 2,465 men of their complement, this proposal, if accepted, would more than answer the demand.

The Duke of Newcastle, the Lord Chancellor, and the Duke of Richmond gave immediately into the scheme of Sir John Norris.

Sir Robert Walpole adhered to his own, of withdrawing the protections; and said, in the first place, he did not believe the King would at all relish the scheme of putting his land-forces aboard the fleet; in the next, that if a descent should be made upon England, he did not believe we should find we had more land-forces than were absolutely necessary for our defence against such an attack; and lastly, that he thought it was always most natural and best to get seamen for sea service, if they were to be had, and never have recourse to landmen for that service till all methods for seamen had been tried in vain.

To the first of these objections, Sir John Norris said that we first sat there to give the King the best advice we could for his service and the service of the nation, and not to consider what advice he would like best; that when we had given the best, it was not our fault if he would not take it; and that, all things considered, he saw no way so quick and so sure to get men for the fleet as this.

To Sir Robert Walpole's second objection, the Lord Chancellor answered, that in case of a descent, these troops, as they were to be put on board the squadron for home service, might be relanded.

And to the third, the Duke of Newcastle said, that all other methods had been tried already in vain, as embargoes, pressing, etc.; and that this method would certainly be the quickest, as well as surest, to get men.

Then the Lords of the Admiralty, who had been ordered to attend, were called in—Sir Thomas Lyttelton, Lord Harry Poulet,

and Lord Vere Beauclerk; and after a long unmethodical examination, in which several very impertinent, useless questions were asked, whilst Sir Thomas Lyttelton slowly stuttered an opinion, not worth asking, Lord Vere gave his unasked, and Lord Harry Poulet had none to give, it appeared, that to fit out only seventeen men-of-war to defend this island, 2,465 men were wanting; that to man twenty-five now in commission, there was a deficiency of 4,698 men; that the protections now standing out amounted in all to 14,800, for colliers, coasters, fishers, and outward-bound vessels, of which the two first required only 7,000; that our new complement of men was about 500 men to a ship, our old about 400, and the Spanish complement 620; that the marines already draughted from the Isle of Wight were so bad, from size, youth, and sickness, that by the report of Admiral Cavendish (to whom they were sent) they were useless, and most of them at the hospital; and that there were seven Spanish privateers in the mouth of the Channel molesting every ship of ours, even upon our own coasts, of which the Admiralty received every day advice and complaint, and caused a clamour throughout the whole kingdom. Such at this time was the situation, and these the circumstances, of the maritime strength of this island, that had so long been boasting of its being singly a match by sea for the united naval power of all Europe; and at this hour encountering Spain alone, if the Ferrol squadron was to sail to our coasts, and all the men-of-war about our coasts which we can man were drawn out, we should certainly be outnumbered, and consequently lucky if we were not overpowered; and owe our success (as most people do, both in public and private occurrences) rather to the want of skill, industry, and vigilance in our enemies, than to our own possession or exertion of those qualifications.

When the Lords of the Admiralty were withdrawn, I proposed, since the fleet was in so bad a situation with regard to men, that Sir Robert Walpole's advice to overrule the protections should not be laid aside, even though the resolution should be taken by the King to put the two battalions and 1,800 marines on board. I said, I saw no reason why one project should be taken as a *succedaneum* to the other, and thought more especially that we should not content ourselves with a scheme which would at best man but seventeen ships, when we wanted men and nothing but men for thirty; and that I saw no reasons to expect that these marines so draughted, would be better than those the fleet had already received; and consequently, that I looked upon them as what might answer in number to what was proposed, but in no other particular.

1740 After much reasoning, or rather talking, on both sides of this question, it was resolved to stick for the present to the recruit expected from the two battalions and the marines only, and to have recourse to the other method of withdrawing the protections according as we should afterwards find it necessary; and after I had defended Sir Robert Walpole's opinion against the Duke of Newcastle, not alone for that reason, though that alone perhaps would have been sufficient, I concluded by saying, since this seemed to be the opinion of the majority of their Lordships, that the land-forces were to be taken to supply the fleet, before all ways had been tried to supply the sea the natural way by seamen, I acquiesced; but since, in case of an invasion, they were to be relanded, I thought this method, and depending on this only, would reduce us to the dilemma of the sea-service robbing the land, or the land the sea.

Sir Robert Walpole then proposed that Ogle, with his ten ships, should be immediately sent for home by a packet-boat despatched specially for that purpose. The Duke of Newcastle proposed to have Ogle sent to the West Indies to reinforce Vernon—all his Grace's politics being founded on short maxims of policy, gleaned in private conferences in the House of Lords during the Session from Lord Carteret, who had over and over again told him: "Look to America, my Lord; Europe will take care of itself. Support Vernon, and you will want no support here." Sir Robert Walpole insisted, however, on sending for Ogle home; he said, no Spanish recruits being gone to America, no English recruits were wanting there. That we were at the mercy of France for want of strength here. That *the whole* was in danger here; and that as the consideration of the whole should always take place of the consideration of a part, we wanted strength, and must get what strength we could at home; and since the Lords of the Council would not come into his proposal to augment our strength by getting more seamen here, we must send for those we could get from abroad; and as the Ferrol squadron was now superior to Ogle and Balchen both, the sooner we could get them home the better, as they were useless there, and wanted here. I supported Sir Robert Walpole, and said, that I thought the present posture of affairs in Europe required all our attention here; and that our only dispute ought to be whether we should send for Ogle and Balchen home with their fifteen ships, or send ten from hence to join them and make a blockade before Ferrol, as we had done formerly before Cales; and though I had never heard this last scheme of blocking up the Cales and Ferrol squadron at Ferrol mentioned in Council; yet if it was feasible (though the feasibility I did not pretend to judge

of), it was a measure to be preferred to any other whatever, as it 1740
would enable us with twenty-five ships to defeat all the three views
Spain might have, of going to America, disturbing my Lord Cath-
cart's expedition, or making a descent on England or Ireland;
whereas if their fleet could come out, we should not have a naval
force sufficient for three distinct branches of strength to oppose these
views, and wherever we employed what strength we had, we should
be vulnerable in the two other places.

April 29. Session ended.

May 8. Princess Mary married.

May 13. King embarked at Gravesend.

May 24. King landed [at Helvoetsluys].

May 26. Regency opened.

May 27. 11,000 men in Ireland. Want arms. No man-of-war
on the coasts. Papists searched in vain. 13,000 arms here for land
service; 5,000 for sea service. 5,000 in Ireland, 2,000 useless.
5,000 more demanded from hence. Contract with Board of Ord-
nance to deliver 12,000 arms between September 1739 and Sep-
tember 1740; 8,000 ought in consequence to have been delivered;
300 at most have. Utrecht and Liège to be tried by letter to Mr.
Trevor from Duke of Newcastle. Spaniards, 3 men-of-war only
at Catalonia.

[*June*] 1st. Relating to corn insurrections. Attorney and Soli-
citor consulted.

Spy to be continued on the Pretender's son.

Repeat orders, and promises of reinforcement to Vernon.

Hope both squadrons at Ferrol in a bad condition. Dutch ships
forbid to enter Gibraltar with corn.

Mr. Trevor to be written to on this, and to know what arms may
be had in Holland or Flanders.

KENSINGTON GRAVEL PITS, *July 5, 1742.*

MY LORD,

Being quite tired of waiting in expectation of knowing something decisive with regard to the present disagreeable impending affair, in order to the sending back of your Lordship's messenger, I have determined to keep him no longer; but unfit as I am for writing myself, my temper being so ruffled, and my mind so agitated by the constant hurry I have lived in of late, I am forced to make use of a secretary to acquaint your Lordship with the remarkable particulars of what passed between the King and me in his closet upon this occasion.

When I first went in, I began by saying: "I hope Your Majesty does not imagine I am impertinent enough to have given you the trouble of this audience in order to expostulate with you, whether it is fit or not for Your Majesty to remove me out of that office in which I have now the honour to serve you. I am not one of those who think they have a right to dictate to Your Majesty who you shall or shall not employ; and however successful those who have acted in that manner have lately been, I envy them not their success by such methods, and upon such terms. The very words of the tenure by which we hold our offices is, during Your Majesty's pleasure, and when that alters I know of no privilege any one has to ask Your Majesty your reasons; and since this change from me to my Lord Gower has been so represented to Your Majesty, as to induce you one moment to believe that there is a chance for any one obstacle, that now obstructs Your Majesty's measures, or any one difficulty, in which you find yourself now entangled, to be removed by putting this change in execution, I am so far from desiring Your Majesty to let your partiality to me prevent your trying it, that there is nobody in Your Majesty's councils can press you more strongly to put it to the trial than I would do if there was occasion. Nay, I will go still further, and say, since Your Majesty has been told that you are putting me in one scale in balance against the whole Tory party in the other, and risking even your crown to support me, that I would, for the first time in my life, though Your Majesty commanded me to stay, disobey your orders and resign my office, since it is much too great a weight for me to take upon me to be respon-

sible for all the difficulties Your Majesty in futurity may meet with, 1742
and for your Ministers to say, what I can never be able in the nature of things to disprove, that all these misfortunes were owing to their advice not being followed in the measure they have now proposed; and as all I could urge relating to the expediency of this measure, considered in a political light, might be thought to proceed from personal motives, as I am personally concerned, I shall not enter into the discussion of that point, but leave Your Majesty to be convinced by future experience, whether personal or political reasons have induced your Ministers to push it. I do not therefore complain of the thing itself, but of the manner of doing it."

Here the King interrupted me, and said: "My Lord, if my Lord Carteret did not bring my message to you in a manner that showed that I have been forced into this thing, among many others that I have been obliged to do, quite contrary to my inclination, and in a manner that showed how sensible I am both of your desire and abilities to serve me, he did not obey my orders; since I charged him to assure you that there was nothing in my power to make you easy in the manner of making this change, that I would not do to oblige you."

I thanked His Majesty for his kind disposition and intentions towards me, and said my Lord Carteret had done that in the most ample manner; that I had nothing to complain of, or object to my Lord Carteret, who had behaved on this occasion to me, not only like a man of sense, but with the utmost politeness, and a regard for me which from him I had no reason to expect or right to claim. "But what I complain of, Sir, is that as Your Majesty, before I went into the country to my father, notwithstanding the frequent opportunities you had from seeing me in private, never gave the least hint that you should be forced to yield, and give me up in this attack; and that upon my return to London, the first news I should hear of it should be from the Prince and his people publicly singing their songs of triumph throughout the whole town for this victory being at last obtained over Your Majesty and me, and that your own Ministers should be whispering it about to every one in your antechambers that this thing was done, before I had received any intimation from Your Majesty that it was even designed."

Here the King again interrupted me, and said the reason why he had not mentioned it to me before I went into the country was because he had positively refused, for three months together, in the most peremptory manner, ever to take this step, and did not intend to depart from that resolution. That, as to his son, I knew he was a vain puppy, and so great a liar that there was no dependence to

1742 be had on anything he said; and, for his own Ministers, if they had spoken of this thing as a thing done, they were as great liars, for that they all very well knew he had told them that it should not be done till I was made easy in the manner of doing it; and that he had commanded my Lord Carteret to let me know that such was his intention and resolution.

I said my Lord Carteret had done so; but that when I had pressed my Lord Carteret to name what that method was to be which was to make me easy, he had named nothing but a pension of £3,000 a year, which I flatly refused and said I looked upon in a light so different from an equivalent and compensation for what I was to give up, that I could consider it only as an additional disgrace; since from the moment I consented to be rolled in the dirt of that pensionary gutter, though I should speak afterwards in the House of Lords in support of His Majesty, his measures, or his interest, with the brains of a Solomon, and the lips of a Tully, it would not be in my power to be of more use to His Majesty than my Lord Willoughby¹; and as I had nothing in public life at heart but the keeping up my own credit and reputation and the being able to serve His Majesty, so all I desired was an honourable and plausible pretence to remain in his service, and support him and his measures with the same zeal and attachment which I had hitherto done. But as possibly the Prince might think his triumph over the ashes of a dead mother and the authority of a living father incomplete, unless he was gratified in the manner of my removal as well as the removal itself, and insisted on my being kicked out of His Majesty's Court as well as removed from my employment, so possibly his Ministers, who had pressed the one, might likewise have promised the other, and would consequently obstruct everything that could be proposed towards defeating His Royal Highness's intentions or the executing His Majesty's, since I did not perceive any one step they had taken, or any one piece of advice they had given, since Lord Orford retired, that did not tend to the exalting his son's power and to the lowering of his own; that I would venture to prove to the ablest of His Majesty's Ministers (which, putting my Lord Carteret out of the question, I looked upon to be no very bold encounter), that the whole progress of their conduct has been to advise a series of

¹For the case of the 15th Lord Willoughby of Parham see Namier, *Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, p. 275. Lord Hardwicke said of this pension: "I look upon such pensions as a kind of obligation upon the Crown for the support of ancient noble families, whose peerages happen to continue after their estates are worn out." (*Ibid.* p. 278.)

concessions on the part of His Majesty, without taking care of one single return that was to be made. 1742

"Your Majesty very well knows the progress of these counsels, where they take their rise, and how they are pursued; for, though seemingly and politically blind for prudential reasons at this time, Your Majesty cannot possibly be actually so to what all the world sees and knows. Your Majesty cannot but be sensible that in all these changes, removals, and promotions, you have not been able to protect any one man they had determined to disgrace, or prefer one whom they resolved should not come in; all that has been left to be done in Your Majesty's closet has been to force you to give your fiat to what has been previously concerted and settled by your son and Mr. Pulteney at Carlton House, and conveyed to Your Majesty by the Duke of Newcastle and Mr. Pelham, who are to have all the merit with the Prince of promoting his pleasure, his measures, and his creatures, and shelter themselves from Your Majesty's anger, whilst they are gaining his favour, by exclaiming themselves against what they propose, and saying it is intolerable, unreasonable, and unjust; but that Mr. Pulteney's authority, weight, consideration, and power, is such in the House of Commons, that there is no withstanding it at present, and that his demands, though ever so exorbitant, must be complied with.

This being the present situation of affairs, I only desire to give Your Majesty a short sketch of the true state of this kingdom and your palace at the present juncture.

As to Government, the present posture, or rather no posture, but chaos of things, cannot deserve the name, for Government there is none. The titles of Government belong not to persons who exercise all the authority of it. Your Majesty bears the name of King and wears a crown, whilst all the authority of the one, and the power of the other, is exercised by another. My Lord Carteret has the credit in your closet and the name of your Minister, whilst Mr. Pulteney possesses and exercises the power of both. Parliament there is none; the Secret Committee has absorbed and engrossed the whole power and authority of that body into their narrow faction.

Your Court is divided into classes, knots, parties, and cabals of men, all with different views, different principles (if they have any), and different interests, contending with one another for power, each thinking to deceive and overreach the other, and all pursuing their own private personal interests, and their own short and narrow views, without considering Your Majesty's, the national and general interest, one moment in any one action.

1742 When I consider the individuals that compose your Administration, I find nothing but men of as different complexions there. Some concealed Jacobites, some avowed Republicans, some treacherous friends and cowardly enemies; others who, having forced themselves into Your Majesty's service (or, more properly speaking, into employment), think they have no obligation to Your Majesty for being there, feel and know themselves disagreeable to you now they are there, and consequently think of nothing but themselves, and remaining there upon the same foot of force and constraint by which they got in.

How long such a Government, such a Court, and such an Administration, can subsist upon the foot it now stands, or rather totters, must be obvious to the meanest capacity, and the meanest judgment of those titled ciphers about Your Majesty's palace and person, who are really become the best people there, because, from having too little sense to have any meaning at all, they mean no hurt, but are equally incapable of doing any good.

A ship may weather one or two storms, but no ship can long live in perpetual tempests, nor any Government subsist in perpetual fermentation, struggle, and tumult; and where these commotions will end I pretend not to say, and defy the wisest to foresee.

I have laid these particulars before Your Majesty, and opened this scene with the same fidelity that I have always served you, giving you the best intelligence I am able, without considering who it may oblige or disoblige, and leaving Your Majesty's better judgment to form your own opinion and take your own measures upon such representations. I belong to no class, faction, or party; have no attachment but to your service; no connexion but with your interest and inclination; belong to you and to no other, and am attacked and pursued for no other reason. But if these are principles, and this a conduct, by which I cannot be supported in Your Majesty's Court, the sooner I am out of it the better, for I can change neither, and desire to be supported on no other. I have from the beginning of last winter committed myself entirely to Your Majesty's protection. I knew if there was a disposition in Your Majesty to do me right, there was nothing could hurt me that was said or done by my enemies, and that if that disposition was wanting, nothing that was said or done by me could do me any good. I therefore leave myself and my cause just where it was; and do not pretend to say I am so made as to be able to forget or forgive, if I am ill used, those who can prevail with Your Majesty to put me in that situation, but will do them all the hurt I am able, and distress them in every article

I can contrive; and as all men are vulnerable in some place or at some time or other, and that every Achilles has his heel, so patience and good sense will always wait and find an opportunity where the strongest may be come at." 1742

Having related to your Lordship the most material particulars of this very long conference with the King, I shall descend into no more minute detail. He seemed thoroughly satisfied with my conduct, and assured me, over and over again, that this removal should be made as easy to me as he could contrive.

Upon reading over this letter, I recollect two things I had omitted, which are of as much importance as any. The one is that when I represented the state of His Majesty's palace, and pictured with indignation and contempt the men who compose his Administration, I always took care to confine myself to the home affairs, and to except Lord Carteret out of every fault I laid to his Ministers' charge, saying I knew him to be the only man of sense about His Majesty, and that I really believed his judgment was good enough to know that whilst His Majesty thought fit to employ him, the interest of his master must be the first article of his own interest; but that, conscious of the difficulties in which the home affairs were at present involved, he had wisely taken the part of confining himself to foreign transactions, in which I own the advice given to His Majesty had been bold, the undertaking hazardous, but steadily conducted, and hitherto most fortunately prosecuted; "but this," I said, "will avail him as a Minister, or Your Majesty as a King, but little, unless you can put things upon a more steady, quiet, and permanent foot at home. Whilst Hannibal abroad was humbling the Romans, conquering all Italy, and crowned with laurels in every undertaking, those laurels served but for a chaplet to adorn his sacrifice when he was ruined by a faction in the senate at Carthage: this would be the case if even the success abroad should continue; but if any alteration should happen there, Lord Carteret's ruin would be yet more precipitate."

The other thing I had forgot to mention was that when the King, in the progress of our conversation, told me it had been said that it was impossible I could object to the scheme of bringing in these men in point of policy, because I had been the first who proposed it to His Majesty, I said I had resolved not to enter into the expediency of this measure at present as an act of state, because I was personally concerned; yet, since His Majesty had made it necessary for me to break that resolution by what he had just said, my answer was this: "In the first place, when I proposed this scheme to Your Majesty,

1742 it was only in case the Whig party could not be united, which union, I appeal to Your Majesty, was always the measure I preferred to all others, and which might have been effected, had it not been for the private grudges and personal piques of those who profess themselves the warmest champions for the Whig party, which prevented it. But in case that union could not be brought about, then, and then only, I proposed this measure, as the single way to prevent a flood of Tories coming in, and to put the party of Tories in the hands of Your Majesty instead of putting you into their hands: and, as this advice must either have been good or bad, I desire to ask Your Majesty's Ministers, if it was good, why it was then opposed? if it was bad, how comes it to be now adopted? and if it was good, can it be just in Your Majesty to make the first adviser the first sacrifice? I have heard of '*Necis artificem arte perire suâ,*' but that '*salutis artificem*' should undergo the same fate is a maxim I never heard advanced, and, till my own case, never knew practised. But I will go still further, and prove to Your Majesty that when I proposed this scheme it was good, and that now they who then opposed it have urged it, it is bad; for when I advised it, it would have been thought a grace and favour from the Crown; it is now looked upon as a new violence and imposition upon the Crown. It is known to be the act of Carlton House, not of Kensington, and whatever thanks are paid from the men that come in of the Tory party, they are paid to the Prince, and not to Your Majesty; consequently, the executing this scheme at this time is strengthening his hands and widening his interest; whereas, when I mentioned it, it would have strengthened Your Majesty's and widened your basis."

I summed up the whole by telling His Majesty all that I desired was that he would demonstrate to the world that my removal was a measure of government, not an act of inclination—merely political, not personal—and that though I might be lowered in my employment, that I was not lowered in his favour, and provided this was effectually done, it was quite indifferent to me in what way, and that, if it was not to be done, the sooner I knew it the better; that long ill-health had pretty well blunted the appetite of ambition; that the usage I had met with had pretty well cured me of my taste for Courts; and that the infinite goodness of my father had made my circumstances so very easy, that I was as much above wanting the profits of a Court, as I was from trying to obtain them any way but by the creditable and honest methods I had hitherto pursued whilst I had been there.

LORD HERVEY TO THE EARL OF BRISTOL. 1742

KENSINGTON GRAVEL PITs, July 15, 1742.

MY LORD,

The day after I wrote to your Lordship I heard, from very good intelligence, that my enemies at Court, the leading men in the present motley Administration, had resolved to take a new turn in order to remove the impression which they found my audience had made upon the King; but, before I relate to your Lordship the resolutions they came to, I must acquaint you in what manner all their most secret transactions came to be known. Their *sanctum sanctorum* is composed of my Lord Carteret, Lord Winchelsea his adherent, the Duke of Newcastle and his quibbling friend my Lord Chancellor, Mr. Pulteney, and Harry Pelham. Lord Carteret, Duke of Newcastle, and Mr. Pulteney, whilst they act seemingly in concert at this juncture, having distinct views and different interests of their own to pursue, are all striving to deceive and overreach one another; and each separately relating to their own private friends what passes at these conferences conducive to their own points, the whole of the conference, through different channels, flows into the world. Lord Carteret, feeling he has the strength of the closet and the confidence and favour of the King, whilst he is making his court by foreign politics, hates and detests Mr. Pulteney for all the trouble he gives him in pursuing his points at home; and knowing that, the moment Mr. Pulteney goes into the House of Lords, he will become an absolute nullity, he is ready to feed the exorbitant appetite of his demands with any morsels it craves for at present, provided in return he can gain that one point of Mr. Pulteney's going into the House of Lords. On the other hand, Mr. Pulteney, knowing he has at present the House of Commons in his hands, and seeing too plainly that though he has the power of the closet, he has none of the favour, and that every point he carries there is extorted, not granted—carried by force, not by persuasion—hates my Lord Carteret for engrossing that favour which he proposed at least to share, if not to engross himself; and whilst he is forcing seven or eight of his followers into employment, proposes to remain himself in the House of Commons in order to retain the same power to force a new batch of his friends, three or four months hence, in the

1742 same manner upon the King, which reduces the struggle between Lord Carteret and him to this short point, that if Mr. Pulteney goes into the House of Lords, Lord Carteret dupes him; if he does not, he dupes my Lord Carteret. The Duke of Newcastle, whose envy is so strong that he is jealous of everybody, and whose understanding is so weak that nobody is jealous of him, is reciprocally made use of by those two men to promote their different ends; and being jealous of Lord Carteret from feeling his superior interest with the King, and jealous of Mr. Pulteney from his superior interest to his brother in the House of Commons, is like the hungry ass in the fable, between the two bundles of hay, and allured by both without knowing which to go to, tastes neither, and will starve between them. He wants Mr. Pulteney's power in the House of Commons to be kept as a check and bridle upon Lord Carteret, who has outrun him so far in the Palace, and yet wants Mr. Pulteney out of the House of Commons to strengthen his own power there by the proxy medium of his brother. Thus stands the private contest and seeming union among these present rulers, or rather combatants for rule.

One point the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Pelham, and Mr. Pulteney certainly agree in, which is to get me from the King's ear, and not to suffer the traversing power to all their schemes, which they have felt in so many instances I have there, to maintain its hold, if they by any means can eradicate it, nor to suffer any man about the King who will tell His Majesty their true reasons and motives for everything they propose to him, whilst they are endeavouring to deceive him with false ones; but as it was impossible for them to urge the same arguments to the King, to defeat my expectations and break through his promises in the compensation that was to be made me for my removal, which they made use of to effect the removal itself, that they could not say to the King it was a measure of government, an act of policy to disgrace as well as to remove a man with whose services and conduct and principles the King declared himself thoroughly satisfied, they were forced to change their battery, and make objections to everything that was proposed in my favour, one by one, saying at the same time they thought it highly reasonable something should be done; and knowing I had declared that if that something I was to receive did not accompany what I was to give up, that I should look upon myself as disgraced, and carry on no further negotiation, they knew their point was carried if they could by any means contrive to bring the King to complete my removal, leaving the compensation to future consideration. In order therefore

to effect this, they told the King that the whole machine of govern- 1742
ment at present was at a stop merely upon my account; that all the
changes could not be made without Lord Gower's being immedi-
ately brought in; that till all the changes were perfected, the Parlia-
ment could not rise; that till the Parliament rose, that dreaded rod
of the Secret Committee would be held over the Court and the
Parliament, as in truth it was only adjourned from time to time,
which gave scope to the Secret Committee to find out new matters
to distress the Court. By these methods and suggestions they alarmed
the King's fear—a sensation which in him will ever get the better
of all others—and brought him to listen, contrary to his resolution
and repeated promises, to the methods they proposed for getting rid
of the Secret Committee at anyrate. Knowing this to be my pre-
sent situation with the King, I wrote him the following letter:

SIR,

July 6, 1742.

Relying entirely on Your Majesty's promise by Lord Carteret,
and repeated to me by yourself, that something should be found out
to make this very mortifying removal in the least mortifying manner,
and Your Majesty having given me your word that you would do
anything in your power to make me easy, and laid your commands
upon me to name something, I proposed the Vice-Treasureship of
Ireland, as what Lord Sunderland and Lord Rochester had both
accepted in my situation, which was being removed from Privy Seal
without being disgraced; but, after suffering the mortification of
having Lord Gower preferred to me, I was forced to undergo the
humbling situation not only of standing a contest with Harry Vane,
but to have him likewise preferred to me by the present all-ruling
influence of Mr. Pulteney. This I had yesterday from Your Ma-
jesty's own lips, whilst you regretted at the same time your own
situation and mine, that you could not give what you wished to
bestow as much as I could wish to receive. Upon this, and Your
Majesty's desiring me to think of something else, I left this affair
yesterday with Your Majesty on a very short issue, which was, to
whom you would give the preference in the other half of this office,
Lord Torrington or me. But, to remove all difficulties in these two
points, I will name a third way, which indisputably must depend
merely on Your Majesty's inclination; and that is, if Your Majesty,
to prove I am not banished your presence and councils, will make
me a Lord of your Bedchamber, and to show you do not mean to hurt
me in my circumstances will add a pension of £2,000 per annum for

1742 thirty years on Ireland, though by this I shall fall so much in rank, and lessen my present income six or seven hundred pounds a year, yet as I desire nothing but a creditable and plausible pretence to support Your Majesty's measures with the same steadiness I have hitherto done, so I think I can justify the acceptance of this small compensation for the hardship the whole world allows has been inflicted upon me; and the pecuniary part of my demand being what Your Majesty, in more than one instance, has thought fit to grant to those whose services, I think, are not much more meritorious than mine, even as an addition to what they before possessed, sure it is much more reasonable to give it as an equivalent for what Your Majesty yourself owns is unjustly (though not in your power to avoid) taken from me. Which of these three ways Your Majesty thinks fit to choose, is quite indifferent to me, as they will any of them produce the same effect in the main point of my remaining with honour in Your Majesty's service.

As to the difficulties in which Your Majesty's own affairs are at present involved, the scene of which I had the honour to open yesterday to Your Majesty, with regard to your Government, your Palace, and your Administration, if there was anybody about Your Majesty that had sense, resolution, and fidelity, besides Lord Carteret (who, I believe, wants none of the three), Your Majesty might easily surmount and be extricated out of them—the whole is at present in your hands—unless Your Majesty will throw yourself and the whole again into those hands that have brought those difficulties upon you.

I look upon this week as the great crisis in which it is to be determined whether Your Majesty is ever to be really King and supreme Governor again in this country, or not; and whether the nerves and essence of government shall again be united to the titles and show of government, or remain in different conflicting situations. It is very plain the methods Your Majesty has lately been advised to take will not produce that union; it is evident to all eyes, and the topic of all conversations.

It is as necessary, too, to the safe and quiet conduct of Your Majesty's affairs that you should unite in the same person the favour of your closet and the power of it. At present, the favour is all bestowed on Lord Carteret, and all the power exercised by Mr. Pulteney. This cannot last; favour and power must go on together, or neither can go on long. It is as essential, therefore, towards constituting a Minister who can subsist, to vest him with these two things, as it is to the fixing Your Majesty's own power to reunite the autho-

1742
rity of the Crown to the name of King. I will open myself more fully either to Your Majesty or Lord Carteret, which you think fit, upon the methods to attain these ends, which I do not think hard at the present juncture to arrive at; but desire, when Lord Carteret relates my conversation to Your Majesty, that nobody may be by, lest in that case Your Majesty, he, and I, may be betrayed to the very man you want to get rid of, and must subdue or be subdued yourself, a treachery I am well warranted to suspect in those whose whole life has been one continued series of treachery and betraying since they first came into the political world.¹ One who was introduced into it under the wing of Lord Townshend; who, when he found Lord Townshend's interest tottering, betrayed him to Lord Stanhope and Lord Sunderland; who, from the same motives, afterwards betrayed Lord Sunderland back again to Lord Townshend and Sir Robert Walpole; who has since betrayed Sir Robert Walpole to Lord Carteret, would betray Lord Carteret to anybody he thought it his interest, and does actually betray his King and his Master to his son and successor. I am, with the greatest respect and fidelity, Sir,

Your Majesty's, etc. etc.

I will, in as short manner as I can, relate to your Lordship how I explained the political latter part of this letter to the King the next time I saw him. I said, as he was most reasonably uneasy at the power Mr. Pulteney really possessed and that which he assumed, and was justly sensible that whilst that Tribune of the Commons had a veto on all his measures, that the principal point he had now to consider was, how to subdue and get rid of him; that there were two ways of doing this. The one was for His Majesty to talk very roundly to Mr. Pulteney, and tell him he would prefer those he recommended provided Mr. Pulteney would go into the House of Lords, which was a condition His Majesty, as well as I, knew that his Ministers had never yet dared directly to propose to him; that if Mr. Pulteney consented to this stipulation, the thing was done, since from that moment he would be nothing but a mere Lord with one vote, and his influence in the House of Commons quite at an end. If Mr. Pulteney refused to comply, His Majesty had nothing to do but, with a high hand, to prorogue the Parliament without promoting any of Mr. Pulteney's people.

What would be the consequence of this? The Secret Committee had already sat so long without doing anything essential or answering

¹The Duke of Newcastle.

1742 anybody's expectations that they had raised the indignation of all their own friends, and were become the contempt of all His Majesty's, except some few Court cowards who were nearest his person. In the meantime Mr. Pulteney would bounce, bluster, and clamour, but that His Majesty would have four months beforehand to bring him to reasonable terms, or to order his affairs so as to bid him defiance. That if His Majesty got the Prince and his family, with my Lord Cobham and his adherents, the Court party in the House of Commons would be too strong for Mr. Pulteney in numbers, besides His Majesty's having all the tolerable speakers there on his side; and supposing the worst to happen that could happen, His Majesty could but be obliged to treat with Mr. Pulteney at the opening of the next Session, and never could have worse terms then imposed upon him than what were now insisted on, if Mr. Pulteney was not to go into the House of Lords, and seven or eight of his followers were notwithstanding to be brought into employment.

July 9 His Majesty felt the force of this reasoning; and whilst for two or three days he was turning it in his own thoughts, all his Ministers were complaining of his ill humour; that they could not get him to do any one thing, and were at a loss to imagine in what manner this devil had been raised. On Friday last he followed my advice, spoke to Mr. Pulteney plainly and strongly, and carried the point of his going into the House of Lords, promising at the same time to comply with all Mr. Pulteney's demands in the changes that were to be made, and put them on Monday in execution.

Here follows what I am ashamed to repeat. He profited of the advice, and made the adviser the first victim, for late on Saturday night I received a letter from Lord Carteret to tell me His Majesty's pleasure was that I should bring the Privy Seal on Monday morning and deliver it to him.

Pursuant to these commands I waited on His Majesty, and, delivering the Seal, said I was at first a little surprised, after the many repeated promises I had received from His Majesty by Lord Carteret, and from his own lips, that some equivalent or compensation should be found out to satisfy me. That in Lord Carteret's letter no mention was made of what I was to receive as well as what I was to give up; but concluding afterwards that His Majesty, from his great goodness, had chosen to communicate the harsher part of his pleasure by another, whilst he reserved the communication of what was more agreeable for his own lips, I begged to know what

his resolution and determination was. He said: "My Lord, you 1742 know I have resisted this measure as long as ever I could; I am now forced to bring it to immediate execution. I hope in time to be able to do something you may like; and in the meanwhile am very ready to give you a pension of £3,000 a year." I told His Majesty that the pension was what he knew I could not possibly bring myself to accept, as I thought it would hurt my character, which I was determined to maintain in the best manner I could; that it was in the power of a Court to disgrace me, but in nobody's but my own to discredit me; that I had made different proposals to His Majesty in what manner he might perform his promise of doing anything in his power on this occasion to satisfy me. He said it was impossible for him to comply with any of those proposals. I answered, that with regard to Mr. Vane *impossible* might be the case, as His Majesty might not have power to resist Mr. Pulteney; but with regard to the other two, they were both in His Majesty's power, and his inclination could only be wanting to do either of them. He still recurred to this sentence: "My Lord, they are all impossible." I then said if that is the case, that none of these things are to be done, that I must look upon myself as disgraced; and that it was very plain His Majesty had promised to do what in one case he could not, and in two others what he would not perform; and as I had acquainted all my friends with the promise he had made me, I was reduced to the disagreeable necessity of proving that His Majesty had altered his mind, and gone back from that promise, or I must take a lie upon myself (which it was impossible for me to do) by acknowledging I had reported what I had not been warranted to affirm; and for these reasons I thought it had been much better for His Majesty, and kinder to me, in the first step of this affair, to have ordered Lord Carteret to tell me I must deliver the Seal with only some general words, expressing His Majesty's reluctance to take this step, saying, it was one among many others that he was forced to contrary to his inclination, and then this matter would have been at a much quicker, as well as more agreeable end.

He always dwelt upon his sorrow in general for what I proposed being impossible, or his hopes of something happening that might be agreeable to me, commendations of my conduct, acknowledgment of my services, and thanks to me for my attachment and fidelity. Many more things passed in the course of this interview, with the recital of which I shall not now trouble your Lordship.

One thing more only that I said I would acquaint you with. I

1742 told His Majesty that I really thought my honour, credit, and character, quite out of this question; for that the question was not whether he could or would not show personal favour to my Lord Hervey, but whether he would show the world that the assiduity and fidelity with which all mankind knew, and he acknowledged, I had served him, were the two most dangerous qualities any man could bring into his Court; for if that was the case, his Court could only be filled with bullies, knaves, and fools; and that I thought his honour doubly engaged, as he had given his promise to show that he would not suffer a servant of his to be discarded and punished for no other reasons than having served him well, and him only. "For supposing, Sir (I continued), one of Your Majesty's footmen had been beaten for trying to keep an insolent mob off your coach, which mob had shown that they were endeavouring to approach your coach only to insult you—to force you to let them drive it, or else to attempt to overturn it—could Your Majesty possibly, at the instigation of that very mob, turn away such a footman with the same marks of your displeasure that you would do any servant who deserved such treatment by the worst behaviour, and keep those only in your service who had, underhand, encouraged that mob which he had resisted?"

The strange weak answer he made to this can never be guessed, and will scarcely be credited, when I say it was: "My Lord, there would not be so much striving for a footman's place."

Upon taking my leave I said all my friends had told me, and I myself believed, that after the very particular manner in which I had lived with and served him for so many years, after the good opinion His Majesty had to everybody declared he had of me, and the repeated promises he had made me by himself and Lord Carteret, it was impossible he should part with me in any manner that would disgrace me, and without giving me something that would show that was not his intention. But I hoped it would be thought no disrespect to say to His Majesty on this occasion what is said in the gospel of God himself, that I found with kings all things were possible.

I did not care to break into this narrative of my transactions with the King by giving your Lordship any account, which would have seemed digression, of some concomitant steps I took with Lord Carteret whilst this affair was depending; but when I found that he had been very backward in pushing those points with the King, which I had flattered myself, from what he had said to me, he would have been glad to promote, at the same time I

wrote my last letter to the King, I sent the following letter to 1742
Lord Carteret:

July 7, 1742.

MY LORD,

The alteration in your Lordship's manner of acting has made so great a one in my manner of thinking (the one, as I always told your Lordship, being dependent on the other), that I have now no inclination or desire about this disagreeable negotiation but to have it concluded—in what manner, I am thoroughly indifferent; since, either way, the part I have to act is a very plain one, and as I perceive it clearly, I shall pursue it resolutely—two things which I cannot help valuing myself upon, since *clear* and *resolute* are, I see, at present so little the characteristics of anybody's opinions or actions but my own. I am not vain enough to fancy myself, in our commotions, of as much consequence as the King of Prussia in those of Europe, to whom one may apply that line in Lucan, where he says—

Momentumque fuit mutatus Curio rerum;

but I am not humble enough neither to think I shall be quite a feather in whatever scale your Lordship chooses to throw me. However, as my chief point is not to be kept here longer in suspense, losing my time and hurting my health, in dangling after an affair I am most heartily tired and sick of, and that the *cross or pile*¹ decision of it will not give me one moment's uneasiness, I must end where I began, and entreat your Lordship that I may at least have this obligation to you, of deferring no longer to let me know what is determined.

I am, with great respect,

My Lord, etc. etc.

To this letter I received the following answer:

MY LORD,

I am extremely sorry that your Lordship should think there is the least alteration in my manner of acting towards you. If you think me mysterious because I do not explain, your Lordship does me great injustice; for the truth is, that I am quite ignorant as yet whether the Vice-Treasurer's place will be given to your Lordship or not. Your Lordship, I hope will be so good as to be—

¹*Toss-up*.

1742 I lieve that whatever is the case, it is far from being my choice that your Lordship should be thrown, as you express it, into a contrary scale. The moment that I know what will be the turn which His Majesty will give to this affair I will do myself the honour to acquaint you, and am,

My Lord,
With the greatest respect and truth,
Your Lordship's most humble
and most obedient Servant,

CARTERET.

I must tell your Lordship that in all my conferences with Lord Carteret he understood my situation with regard to him, and I his with regard to me, to be this. I told him always, if I could not remain at Court agreeably to him, that I did not care how soon I quitted a place where I knew I had and desired to make no other friend; he always telling me that there was no man in England he wished more to make his, and said, even in our first conference, his situation was the oddest in the world, for that he was forced by a combination of circumstances to join in a measure of which he approved neither the political nor personal part, and to run the risk of disoblighing one whom he knew could serve him, for the sake of people who could not serve him if they would, and who, he knew, would take the first occasion to hurt him if they could.

A thousand particulars relating to this negotiation occurring every minute to my memory, if I was not so fatigued as to be unable to transmit more of them, I believe this letter would swell to the size of M. de Thou's History; but the rest I will reserve for a verbal conference with your Lordship, and will only add that notwithstanding the little sleep I have by night, and all these mortifications I meet with by day, my looks, strength, and spirits are so visibly and perceptibly mended, that it is as surprising to other people as unaccountable to,

My Lord,
Your Lordship's most obedient and dutiful Son,

HERVEY.

P.S. I have at Lord Carteret's earnest entreaty deferred resigning my son's commission till the Parliament rose, but shall then immediately send it to the King, and have this comfort at least in the result of all these transactions, that there will be that one circumstance of getting him out of the army (so much wished by your

Lordship¹) agreeable to you, though there is no one circumstance 1742
throughout the whole agreeable to me. I hear of nothing, wherever
I go, but Lord Carteret's encomiums on my conduct in every step
of this affair, to which he gives such epithets as I am neither vain
enough to repeat nor to think I deserve.

¹Lord Bristol objected so strongly to his eldest grandson's going into
the army that he had made some penal alterations, which he now
cancelled, in his will.

APPENDIX II

AN ACCOUNT OF MY OWN CONSTITUTION AND ILLNESS, WITH SOME RULES FOR THE PRE- SERVATION OF HEALTH; FOR THE USE OF MY CHILDREN.

Written in the Year 1731

BY LORD HERVEY

I CANNOT help prefacing this little treatise with assuring all those into whose hands it shall fall that as my motive for writing it is the charity of a parent, not the vanity of an author, so I design it merely for the benefit of my own family, without any views to the press.

And as it is calculated for the use of particulars, not the discussion of the public, I shall not in the least pique myself upon style, method, or erudition in the matters it treats of, but confine myself to a bare, simple narrative of my own complaints, the means I tried to relieve them, the progress of my illness, and the steps of my cure.

For as it is probable my children may have the misfortune to find the hereditary infirmities of my constitution entailed upon theirs, I should be glad in some measure to recompense the involuntary injury of such a legacy by the best antidote I can collect from the opinions of the many physicians I have consulted, and the various trials I have had of the different effects of their prescriptions.

And if by these means I can soften to my posterity what I could not help inflicting, I hope they will thank me for the benefit, and dare to say they will easily believe me when I tell them how often I have repined to think it was not in my power to give them a being exempt from those alloys that have so much embittered and so often endangered the possession of my own.

I am so little versed in the science of physic, though I have been so unwillingly conversant in the experimental part of it, and am consequently so ignorant of all the technical mechanical part of

writing on this subject, that it is very possible I may often try to explain myself in very improper terms ; but as I choose rather to be intelligible in my meaning than orthodox in my expression, so I had much rather incur the imputation of ignorance, whilst I endeavour to inform, than follow the example of my brother quacks, and acquire the reputation of learning by endeavouring to confound.

This conduct perhaps may often expose me to the cavils, criticisms, and censure of that honest and able fraternity, of which the generality are more solicitous to gain one fee than to save ten lives; and the best of them more concerned for the orthodoxy of their prescriptions than the efficacy of their medicines; but I shall go steadily on in my own way, as careless of their comments as I wish I had ever been of their advice; and I give them free leave to repay the contempt I have for their practice in whatever ridicule they please to throw upon my theory.

All chronic distempers whatever, I think, may be ranged in two classes, as proceeding always from an hereditary or an acquired cause. Those under the first head, and the hardest to cure, come from the indiscretion of our parents, the others from our own.

And, indeed, there is such an affinity between gouty, scorbutic, rheumatic, scrofulous, and even venereal cases in the second generation, that I think the manner in which they ought all to be treated is much the same; as the different names that are given to these distempers (according to my notions) proceed rather from the different parts in which the humour shows itself, than any real difference in the humour itself.

As, for example, the matter that is called scrofulous if it obstructs the passage in a gland of the throat and forms a tumour there, would, if it had made that obstruction in any of the capillary vessels of the hands or feet, be styled the gout; in the gums it would be called scorbutic; in the kidneys or bladder, stone or gravel; in knotted lungs and a cough, consumption; and if more diffused over the whole body in cutaneous spots, dry scurf, or running sores, it would pass for a leprosy, or second-hand pox.

Of most, and the worst of these complaints, I think the genteel world have the noble advantage to boast the monopoly; for though here and there a man of mean extraction may have raised himself into a great fortune and the gout, yet as this distemper is a badge of gentility, that like an oak has not time to come to its perfection during the life of those who plant it, so wherever this curse of God punishes the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and

fourth generation, it is generally more severe and begins earlier than in the lives of those whose own luxury (that is gluttony and laziness) first contract it.

A thorough cripple can always trace his gentility as far backward as the Teutonic Order, or a Knight of Malta; and my own mother, whom I look upon as the vehicle of all the ills I ever complained of, could, I believe, quarter the gout upon her pedigree, by the assistance of Howards and Feltons, through at least twenty yards of parchment.

However, as my complaints never showed themselves in those parts of the body that are privileged to have the gout, the gentlemen who have usurped an arbitrary right of christening distempers (and like another fraternity often baptize without cleansing) would never give them that title.

They lost, or changed their name, as rivers sometimes do, by not flowing through the particular banks that give them their denomination; and though the waters were certainly of that spring, yet as they did not run in the ordinary channels of that disease, they were not distinguished by that appellation.

The complaints I had in my stomach had all the marks of that distemper when it comes there, but as it had not previously made its appearance in my hands or feet, and taken its common progress to my stomach, so these disorders were always called the colic.

After every fit of it I used to void in urine such a chalky kind of matter as forms those knots which obstruct gouty joints; and after violent pains in my face I have very often had little knots of that kind in my gums and in my cheek, which sometimes have broken inwardly, sometimes been dispersed by fomentations outwardly applied, and sometimes remained there in hard lumps after the pain has quite ceased.

Lumps of this kind I have been twice obliged to cut out; the others have either gradually dispersed and worn quite away or diminished enough to be imperceptible to the eye and only to be felt.

From my childhood I have always been subject to feverish disorders and violent headaches, the first of which used generally to be relieved by letting of blood, the other often by a natural bleeding at the nose; and though ever since I left Cambridge I have had a very good appetite, I was remarkable till that time for eating very little; but this I believe proceeded from the inordinate love I had for sweet things, with which I had always favour enough at home, and money enough at school, to gratify my taste and spoil my stomach.

Of all things I would caution my children against indulging themselves in this sort of food. It turns sour on most people's stomachs and clogs the alimentary passages of all.

I know Mr. Locke in his *Treatise on Education* speaks of sugar more favourably; and the deference I have for his opinion on most occasions would certainly make me alter my own upon this if any speculation or reasoning could bias me against fact by experience.

There is nothing that sugar will not make ferment. I know I may be told that all digestion is made by fermentation, but let those who make this answer consider that though liquors are clarified by some fermentation, yet they are spoilt, too, by too great a degree of it; and the champions for brandy might, from the same way of reasoning, just as well defend the use of that poison by alleging the necessity of warmth in the stomach and how little it would be able to perform its functions without it.

If the patrons of sugar say, then, you may take it in less quantities, I shall readily agree that that will make it less hurtful, but I believe they would be extremely puzzled to prescribe the quantity in which it would prove beneficial.

Nature has given heat and fermentation to the stomach sufficient to work off as much food as is necessary for her recruits and our sustenance; and whenever an additional, artificial force is wanting for that mill to do its office, the fault is never at first in the machine but in the sort or the quantity of the grist; and in those cases I would much sooner unload it than lend it any assistance to strain its faculty and carry the burden through. But this I shall speak of more at large hereafter in its proper place.

The first outward sign I had of this inward ambush poison I have spoken of, that was latent in my composition from the moment that I was conceived, was a humour in my eyes, with which I was confined to my room for near half a year and afflicted in a less degree as much longer.

For this complaint I ran the gauntlet through the hands of all the famous oculists, doctors, and surgeons in England. The first of these only applied some insignificant nostrums, but the others bled, purged, and blistered me till I had neither strength to stir nor spirits to desire it.

After being tormented in this manner to no purpose for a year I was cured by an eye-water I heard of accidentally and which I tried in despair rather than faith. It was made by an old and poor woman (since dead) who lived in Katherine Wheel Yard in Brentford; and had so much of the quackery of her brother-operators,

that, although she owned it was a distillation from simples, I could never bribe her to give me the receipt or tell me any one of the ingredients, and as she retailed it only at a crown a quart, which would serve anybody for constant use a year, I offered her a sum (with a promise to keep her secret) that amounted to much more than she could ever have got by me annually, though I had lived with sore eyes and her patient to the age of Nestor. It is now made by her executors, who are much more indigent than the heirs to so valuable a legacy ought to be, and inherit her obstinacy in keeping the secret, as well as her art.

Upon any cold or any weakness in my eyes after riding in dust, or after too much reading or writing by candle light, I still use this water, and never without benefit. I have prescribed it to many people and always with success.

But though I got the better of this particular effect of the virulent humour that plagued me afterward in so many other shapes, yet the cause was still latent in me, uneradicated, and ready, like fire pent up but not extinguished, to break out again wherever it found least strength to resist it.

I had headaches again, and in so violent a manner that I have often been obliged to keep myself fasting and in the dark for twenty-four hours together; frequent intermitting fevers, for which I have taken pounds of the bark; and colic, from which I suffered more acute pain than from all my other complaints put together.

In the worst fits I used to have of this distemper, my life has often been thought in great and immediate danger. Nothing would go through me; I kept no medicine that was given me and felt such violent pain and sickness by turns that I used to lie vomiting and swooning alternately for several hours together. Pills of solid opium were generally the first relief I ever found in these cases; they would often come up immediately, but I used to repeat them till one would stay. For three years together I was plagued with this painful and dangerous complaint. The Bath waters always relieved me whilst I was drinking them, but they never prevented the return of my illness in a month or six weeks after I quitted them.

These fits of the colic for the first year were generally at a great distance, but afterwards came every one nearer each other, every one longer than the last, and left me consequently weaker as the attack was stronger and the time to recover shorter.

I tried several physicians, but found it was only changing the hands by which the bills were written and not at all altering the method of prescription. They all jog on in one beaten track; a

vomit to clear your stomach, a glister to give you a stool, laudanum to quiet the pain, and then a purge to cleanse your bowels, and what they call "carry it off."

This was their method in every attack; and, during the intervals, if bitters to restore my appetite, spa-water to raise my spirits, and ass's milk with powder of crab's eyes and oyster-shells to sweeten my blood, would not prevent the returns of my distemper, they none of them knew what else to try.

The common things given to relieve the colic, as juniper drops, aniseed water, and the rest of the hot furniture of an old woman's store-room, who deals in limbecs and receipt-books, I always found made me worse. Glisters and vomits were the only immediate reliefs when laudanum would not stay with me, and if taken in the beginning of the fit, before the laudanum, generally made the opiate take place.

I have sometimes lain before the fire on a carpet for several hours together when the pain has been upon me, with my knees contracted to my chin; sometimes extended on my back upon a couch, with relays of warming-pans upon the pit of my stomach, so hot that the people who held them could not keep their finger a minute upon the part next me, though I have had nothing but a shirt between that and my flesh, which used to be so sore after these operations that I have not been able many times to bear my waistcoat buttoned in several days after the pain has been quite over.

When I was at the worst, I used sometimes to have a pain cross my chest in these fits of the colic, and whenever I had that symptom, it used to throw me into what the physicians in their technical jargon of words without ideas called an hysteric-nervous colic. With this symptom I have often been light-headed and sometimes had the appearance of it without being really so; which is an odd description I know not how better to explain than by naturally relating just what I did and how I felt.

I have fallen into involuntary screamings (with the violence of the pain) which I could not suppress, though I was conscious of the odious noises I was making. The same thing has happened to me in strange incoherent nonsense I have talked, which I sometimes knew to be such yet could not help uttering it. Some people will perhaps call this a degree of madness, and for ought I know very properly; but it always went off, whatever it was, with my pain.

Whenever I had this complaint, I used to make after it vast quantities of pale water; in other fits of the colic I have felt a constant want, without an ability to make any.

I have tried a course of steel and a course of rhubarb, and with patience enough to give them fair play if they could have touched the root of my distemper, but neither of them availed me; the rhubarb I found most beneficial, as it was a purgative medicine and kept those channels in my stomach and bowels open, which were so subject upon these attacks to be charged, and sometimes quite stopped.

The yellowness every fit left upon me made the physicians think there was something of jaundice in my case, that these stoppages proceeded from the gall not filtering freely, and overflowing; and this was their reason for prescribing steel, a course from which I thought at first I found some benefit. But as the complaint for which I entered into it was one of the symptoms and not the cause of my disorders, it made no material change in my constitution.

My third sister,¹ who lived (though never healthy) to about nineteen years old, died of what the doctors called a bilious fever. She was subject to fits and swellings about her neck which (to my sorrow) I found was, amongst many particular complaints, one that was common to us all, which induced me, with other reasons, to conclude that, as much difference as there appeared in some of the symptoms of our distempers, there was great affinity in their cause.

My second sister,² who is now alive, owes her life I believe to that method which, by giving the first turn to this colical humour, preserved mine. She is likewise subject to fits which they call epileptic; and I have a brother³ who has them in as strong a degree.

My eldest sister,⁴ whom I loved better than all the rest of our nursery put together (who had an understanding really to be admired, and a heart that deserved to be so loved), was much more tormented than any of us, by a long series of ill-health, for many years before she died.

She had frequent and violent fevers; never failed of one in the spring, in which she was generally given over by the physicians; was often troubled with pains in her bowels, sickness at her stomach; and had many more of those swellings about her neck than any of us.

She had unfortunately (and the only flaw I knew in her understanding) faith in a physician, and a deference for Dr. Freind, which ended, as the faith of a physician's votary generally does, in the ruin of herself and the discredit of her idol.

¹ Barbara, 1709-1727. ² Ann, 1707-1771. ³ Thomas, 1699-1775.

⁴ Elizabeth, 1697-1727. Married Bussy Mansel, younger son of Lord Mansel.

The bitters, drops, cordials, and other strong things he gave her, though of immediate relief, threw more fire into her blood and certainly increased her future disorders, in a much greater degree than ever they quieted the immediate ones. I was constantly telling her so, but the little transient lift these distant poisons gave her spirits made her unable to resist flying to them ; and his wise doctrine so frequently inculcated of "eat what you can and when you can" made her force her appetite (which her medicine as much as her diseases had contributed to spoil) in such a manner, that she would often eat by the help of flattering her palate, when nature made no call, and of things which, had she been hungry, she had better have fasted than put into her stomach.

I cannot help here observing that she, poor woman, like many other people, often mistook between being able to eat and wanting to eat; and often apprehended taking too little nourishment, which hardly anybody is hurt by, and never feared pressing too much, which almost everybody is hurt by.

I found by experience all hot things so prejudicial to me in their consequences, and was so prepossessed in the opinion of the family defect in all our constitutions being of the gouty kind, and consequently curable only by the remedies for that distemper, that of my own accord I left off wine entirely; but my complaints were grown too potent, were too much interwoven in my constitution, and the juices of my body too much vitiated, for this single negative remedy alone to restore me.

I was growing every day weaker, my spirits more depressed, my pains more frequent, and my fevers more constant, when I read a book of Dr. Cheyne's, on "Health and Long Life," so different from the theory of the rest of the fraternity, so reasonable in its system, and so conformable to my own observation in many particulars, that I resolved to go to Bath, where he lived, in order to consult him, and put myself entirely into his hands.

He advised me to take the Bath waters for six weeks (as I had often done before) in order to cleanse and strengthen my stomach; during that time to eat no meat; and at the end of it to go into a total milk diet for two months. He ordered me to take a vomit of thirty grains of Indian root once a week, in which I obeyed him so punctually that I did it every Monday morning without intermission for six months together. He gave me no other medicine but an infusion of the bark (which I left off in a very little time) and a little rhubarb the day after every vomit.

From the time of my first putting myself into his hands, to this

hour, I never had one formed fit of the colic; though for three years together, according to his prescription, I ate neither flesh, fish, nor eggs, but lived entirely upon herbs, roots, pulse, grains, fruits, legumes, and all those sorts of food which, before I left off meat and wine, I could never eat of, though in the smallest degree, without feeling a pain at my stomach in half an hour after they were lodged there.

The great alteration this regime made in my constitution, as it was the first permanent relief I had ever found, so it convinced me that in all chronic cases no essential changes can be performed but by diet. All medicines (like laudanum) are palliatives, but not remedies; present reliefs, but not radical cures. You may by sudden and great evacuations open stopped passages and give ease to oppressed parts, but the same course of life which clogged those passages will, by certain and infallible revolutions, if you continue in that course, bring you to want the same relief again.

In this case, even the nourishment you take to recover your strength, impaired by these evacuations, lays the seeds of the future necessity of having recourse to them; till by this perpetual vicissitude of dirtying and cleansing the machine you must as infallibly wear out your constitution, though never so strong, as you may a ruby, or any other of the hardest precious stones, by perpetually scratching and polishing it.

But though I discovered, partly by Dr. Cheyne and partly by my own observation, this great truth of health depending much more upon one's cook than one's apothecary, yet I did not by this vegetable diet find that I had hit on the method that could establish mine. I was cured of the colic but not of all complaints, and had exchanged but not banished distempers; for these garden nutriments, though they had purified my blood and mended the habit of my body, so filled my stomach with phlegm and gave me such giddiness in the head that I was not only incapable of any application, but often whole days together as unable as any drunken man to walk straight across a room.

And here I think Dr. Cheyne showed want of skill; for upon my representing this complaint to him he only ordered me whenever I felt it immediately to repeat my vomit, but never assigned it to what I have since, by repeated experience, found out to have been the real cause.

He used to tell me that my stomach being loaded with these immense quantities of phlegm, which came off it upon every vomit I took, proceeded from the extreme parts throwing back upon my

stomach and bowels all that unperspirable bad matter, which overcharged my nerves, and caused those swellings and obstructions that appeared in the glands of my neck and throat; that this was necessary to my cure and vomits necessary to carry it off; but that it was as impossible by vomiting to carry it off all at once, as it would be at once to cleanse a tub of greasy water, the surface of which would again become troubled after every skimming, till the water was entirely purged of all the grease that had been thrown into it.

This was the manner I well remember by which he endeavoured to illustrate his notion of this complaint; at the same time ordering me to persevere in the diet I was then in, without imagining that to be any otherwise the cause of these disorders than as it assisted the habit to "dyspepsia" itself (as he termed it) in that manner.

But the way of reasoning, however plausible it sounded in theory, was not experimentally true; for by length of time, I found all legumes (asparagus excepted) in some degree productive of this phlegm; and some of them, as peas, cabbage, and potatoes, yet more so than the rest. All raw fruit whatever, though taken in very small quantities, will to this day charge my stomach with phlegm, in proportion to the quantity I eat of it, and in very few hours make me giddy in my head.

But though all roots, fruits, herbs, and pulse have this effect upon me, grains have not; wheat, sago, millet, and above all rice, I look upon to be as wholesome food, both with regard to digestion and the blood it makes, as a human creature can subsist upon. It is well known that the inhabitants of the eastern countries, and particularly the Chinese, in a manner live upon it.

I do not pretend to be so deeply skilled in the secrets of nature, the structure of a human body, or the discoveries of physic, as to pronounce these rules adapted to all constitutions, but deliver what I have said as observations upon mine, rather than directions for any other body's, excepting those whose misfortune it may be by consanguinity to have the formation of their machines too unhappily like my own.

I have very naturally and fairly told the inconveniences I found attending on a vegetable diet, but I must at the same time do this justice to it, to say I am firmly of opinion it saved my life, as it gave the first permanent turn to these complaints in my stomach and bowels. The disorders this diet gave me were not mortal; those it removed would, I believe, in a very little time, have proved so.

It certainly cooled that hot, bilious disposition in my constitution, and blunted those salts and sharp humours in my blood, which would

infallibly have corroded, weakened, and spoiled every channel they flowed through, and I think it would be reasoning just as ill to say this diet did me no good, because it gave me an incidental transient uneasiness in its operation, as it would be to affirm bleeding does not benefit those it makes sick, or a purge those it gripes.

I believe I continued in it too long, and am now sensible that, blinded by my aesculapius, Dr. Cheyne, I mistook some of the ills produced by that diet for the effects of that same cause that occasioned my former complaints, only in a different shape.

Another great fault I made whilst I was in this regime was indulging myself in eating of any food that came under the milky or vegetable denomination, though there is as great a difference in the particulars of that as a flesh diet; as much inequality in the sorts of food with regard to hardness and easiness of digestion; and a much greater difference than people generally imagine even in the heating and cooling qualities.

I began to leave off meat in May, and continued gradually mending the whole summer; the winter following I was quite well, these giddinesses only excepted. In February I began the use of the cold bath and the March after had no fever; which was the first year in five I had missed having one in the spring, and in so violent a manner as to have my life in great danger.

My eldest sister too used always to have a fever about that time of the year. I had tried all the arguments I was master of to persuade her to take the same precautional methods I had done to prevent the return of it, but could not prevail. She began to sicken as usual in February, was forced to keep her bed all March, recovered a little, then relapsed, was confined to her room all summer, and in September died, quite emaciated, choked with phlegm, tormented with a constant cough, perpetual sickness at her stomach, most acute pains in her limbs, hysteric fits, knotted swellings about her neck and in her joints, and all sorts of disorders, consequential to a vitiated viscid blood, which, too glutinous and weak to perform its proper circulations, stops at every narrow passage in its progress, causes exquisite pains in all the little, irritated, distended vessels of the body, produces tumours in those that stretch most easily, and keeps the stomach and bowels constantly clogged, griped, and labouring, by the perspirable matter reverting there for want of force to make its due secretions and evacuate itself through its natural channels in the habit and the pores of the skin.

She had so many great, good, and useful, as well as agreeable, qualities, so nice a discernment, so just a judgment, so much

sincerity, principle, and honour, that I lost in her not only an amiable companion but an affectionate friend and an able counsellor, and was so unaffectedly touched with this loss, that her death had like to have been the cause of my own.

The anxiety I suffered some time before she died and the affliction I was in after, took away my appetite, hindered me sleeping, and brought again those feverish disorders, from which I had now been free above a year.

Another thing happened about the same time which afflicted me too a good deal;¹ and though it is usual to say that when people are deeply hurt by one misfortune they are insensible to lesser evils, yet this maxim is a refinement on sensations, and not founded on the knowledge of nature; for a mind already oppressed is easier weighed down by any additional grievance, and feels it more sensibly than it would do at any other time. Nor do I advance this maxim in opposition to common opinion, or more properly speaking to the implicit cant of those who have no opinion but, like echoes, catch sounds with ever-examining sense; I do not, I say, contradict them merely from speculation, but from my own feeling, experience, and observation.

My situation at this juncture was a proof of it; and at the same time a strong instance how quick and powerful an effect any uneasiness of the mind has on the structure of the body when the whole system of the nerves is, by an ill state of health, brought to that inconvenient and dangerous degree of sensibility that mine was.

Tremblings, flushings, cold sweats, and tears were the vicissitudes in which for some time I passed all my days and nights. I neither was fit nor willing to see anybody and consequently lived quite alone for some time; but found the uneasiness of this state so insupportable that after trying hartshorn, sal volatile, and all the trumpery of a vapourish woman's shelf in vain, I had recourse to laudanum, and found the immediate effects of it so charming that I took it very frequently, both day and night, and not in very small quantities.

I now went out again and mixed in company as usual. Those who knew me but little were surprised to see me on a sudden grown so cheerful; but a few who knew me better and loved me enough to observe, and wish me well, soon found out the source of these artificial spirits, and were kind enough to grudge me the ease I owed to so dangerous a cause.

¹ Probably his disappointment at not being offered any political or court post in the new reign in spite of promises made by Walpole to him and by the king to his father (Lord Bristol to Lord Hervey, 28th October, 1727).

Soon after this misfortune befell me I went into the country to Mr. Fox's, who loved me too well not to take a part in anything that made me uneasy and do all in his power to alleviate the weight of it. He accompanied me to Bath, and stayed with me there two months, but the constant recourse I had to this pernicious drug prevented my receiving the accustomed benefit from those waters.

From Bath he went with me to London, and by the force of a very kind, incessant importunity extorted a promise from me never to take laudanum again, but by the advice of a physician.

I was out of order with these tremblings on my nerves, giddinesses in my head, and little transient fevers, the whole winter. I took frequent vomits (sometimes two in a day), but found them only the relief of a day. From mistaking the cause of my giddiness, I was twice blooded, and consequently never the better for it. I took the bark perpetually for that little lurking fever I had hanging about me, but could never keep it off above a week or ten days at a time. All these disorders increasing upon me, I grew to have fainting fits, excessively weak, and the beginning of March fell into so violent a fever that I kept my bed several days and my room several weeks.

In this fever I was twice blooded in the first four and twenty hours, took three vomits in two days, was blistered, purged, and never slept in three days and two nights. Mr. Fox never left me but to eat and sleep, and not always for that.

I took laudanum then by prescription. Dr. Cheyne and Dr. Arbuthnot attended me constantly, but more for form than for any dependence I had on their advice; for excepting the operations I have mentioned that were as much my own prescription as theirs, and which they rather authorised than suggested, I neither did, nor took, any one thing they ordered.

By the force of abstinence, the help of milk and bark which I drank in vast quantities to cool me, and laudanum to quiet me, I got off my fever and acquired strength enough in about two months to go into the country to Mr. Fox's, where I took exercise when I was tolerably well, and vomits when I was ill.

I found by the situation in which I then was how long effects sometimes remain after causes cease; for these disorders, which all returned on my affliction for the loss of my sister, continued to increase long after that affliction began to dim. It is certain that so long as I live, whenever I think of her, it will be as of one I loved as well as I am capable of loving and who deserved, as much as anything human can, to be beloved; but our natures are so calculated

by Providence that I grew not only gradually to reflect on this loss less often, but also with less emotion, whenever I did reflect upon it.

Impressions that are never so deeply made, if they are only preserved by an effort of the memory, and not retraced from time to time by new strokes from our senses, will as infallibly wear out as waters will grow calm and smooth, after the most violent storm, if no new winds continue to ruffle them; their agitation will last in proportion to the violence of the tempest, but after the most violent they will subside at last.

However, notwithstanding the storm of my grief was blown over, and my mind quieted, yet the havoc it had made in my body whilst it lasted, and the means I had used to hasten its calm, had so shattered my constitution that I grew every month perceptibly worse in my health; and these tremblings on my nerves, giddinesses in my head, and faintings, continuing, I thought I had no more time to lose; and as I found myself always better in the summer, I imagined, if anything could recover me, it must be a warmer climate.

I took the resolution, therefore, of going abroad, when Mr. Fox, with an affection and friendship I am as incapable of forgetting, as any nature but his is incapable of feeling, offered to go with me to any part of the world, and for as long as I pleased.

We went first in July, 1728, to Spa, where I found myself for about three weeks surprisingly better for the waters of the Pouhon spring.

I cannot help making one little remark here on the sensible method our English physicians have of advising their patients to a journey to Spa. Their knowledge reaches just far enough to have heard of such a mineral as Spa water and the great cures it has performed; so without knowing the different qualities of the different springs there any better than they know what further to do with you here, away they send you, are quite sure Spa waters will hit your case, and order you to drink them on the place, without ever telling you of what well; which is just as great a proof of their skill as if they were to say, go to an apothecary's and take physic, leaving it to chance, after you came thither, whether you took rhubarb to purge, or mercury to flux you.

The waters of the Pouhon spring there are a strong chalybeate; those of the Geronsterre, without any steel at all, strongly impregnated with sulphur, and good for all consumption and pectoral cures, for which the others are poison. The one is a healing balsamic water, the other stimulating, attenuating, and forcing.

For tremblings, giddinesses, and all disorders that proceed from relaxed nerves, or a foul stomach, and in all bilious cases, I believe the Pouhon waters of great service. For sharpness of blood and all breakings out, the Geronsterre.

But after the first three weeks I had been at Spa the season grew so wet and so cold that I found no more benefit from the waters; and having tried them again and again to no purpose for three weeks more, I left the place as ill as I came to it.

The only cold weather in which these waters are good is frost. In rainy seasons they are thick and lose their spirit. The best time of drinking them is in the heat of summer. But because it is reckoned, and I believe is, really bad to sweat whilst you drink them (as it hinders them passing so freely by urine), you are ordered to drink them always early in a morning. The original reason, therefore, of this order was founded on good sense: but as Mr. Dryden says "Priests of all religions are equally knaves," so I think physicians of all countries are equally fools; and like lovers, the instant they begin to act in that calling, let them be never so reasonable in every other branch of their character, they grow absurd. I cannot give a stronger example of this truth than by relating what I saw a parcel of their credulous, implicit patients submit to at Spa; for, notwithstanding the weather changed in August to the cold of November, these grave, tolerated cheats, the doctors, stuck to their text of: "Be sure you drink the waters early," and there were their poor, shivering votaries every day, wrapped up in cloaks and riding hoods by a great fireside, with hot cloths at their stomachs, pouring down a gallon of cold water at six o'clock in the morning. If I had stayed there long enough, I daresay I should have seen them doing the same in December by a candle, and it would not have been a bit more extravagant.

But the autumn now coming on I began to think of hastening towards the South. I was so ill that I did not care to fatigue my spirits with early rising or very long journeys and, being obliged to stop some time at Paris, I could not pass the Alps till the end of October.

From Turin I went to Florence, from Florence to Rome, and from Rome to Naples. I found little difference in the air of any of these places during the winter, and as I intend to differ from most Italian travellers by giving an account of my peregrinations through this celebrated country merely in the character of an invalid, and not in that of a virtuoso, I shall say nothing further of my progress to Naples than that I grew gradually worse from the time of my

first entrance into Italy to a little before my leaving that city, which was about the middle of April.

And this much I must say of this charming land, this reputed Eden, the garden of the world, that travellers pretend is one perpetual scene of uninterrupted spring, that I never suffered more from cold, or knew a winter of more severe and uncertain weather in England, than I experienced during my three months' habitation in this place.

It was the 20th of April, N.S., when I left it, and the spring was then so backward that the leaves on some trees were hardly budded and none opened, and all the common people so affected with the cold that the men (though so poor that they could not afford shoes and stockings) went clad on their bodies with coats lined with skin, and the women wrapped in red rugs that covered them from the crown of their head down to their knees.

The partisans of this climate pretended that this was a very particular year, but by all I could learn from impartial reporters the preceding winter had been just such another. I believe the truth of the matter is that though the winters in Italy are shorter, yet they are generally sharper than in England, and the reason of their being so, I think, is plain.

Italy, everybody knows, is a long slip of land projecting from the continent in the shape of a man's leg. The Alps run across the top, and the Appenines from the Alps down the middle quite to the toe; by which means it is impossible for any to be set down in any town in Italy (excepting some in Lombardy) where they must not see mountains out of their window; and as all the mountains from the end of October to the beginning of April at least are covered with snow, so all the winds that do not blow from the sea must pass over these hills and consequently come fraught with so many particles of the snows, that the sharpness of their blasts is a sensation unknown to countries less mountainous.

Whenever the winds come from the seas they are less piercing but more inclement; the sky at those times being always obscured, the air damp, the season sickly, and the weather either rain, fogs, snow or a sort of sleet, which is a mixture of all the three.

As this account of the Neapolitan climate is relative to the case of every valetudinarian as well as my own, I reckon it no digression from the intent of these papers, and it will hence appear to my children, if ever they shall want and be advised to go to this country, what they may hope from it in the winter, and of what benefit it was to me.

I never was in immediate danger so long together as at Naples. I grew gradually worse from my arrival to the last fortnight of my stay there at the end of February, when I found my annual fever coming on, by symptoms that always used to precede it, as loss of appetite, dejection of spirits, restlessness, and a sensation in my head I know not how to describe. I reduced my diet absolutely to bread and water, continuing the little exercise I was now able to take on foot or on horseback as long as I could; and when I grew too weak for these, still forcing myself abroad in a coach, even when I was reduced so low that I had not strength to walk upstairs, though supported by two servants, without fainting away.

At last I was confined to my bed by a very high fever. By the importunity of Mr. Fox and merely to gratify him (for I own I had now given over all hope of recovering), I sent for one Cerillo, the best physician of the place, who rather consented to than advised my being twice bled, and gave me no medicine but great quantities of iced water without any other nourishment for six days but a little biscuit which I now and then sopped in it, and the yolks of two eggs in four and twenty hours, and a little bread to eat with them.

This course of iced water, a late but now common prescription for fevers in that country, and seldom fallible, entirely took off mine; but I still continued excessively weak, was worn to nothing but skin and bones, and fainted several times in a day.

As soon as I was able I was carried every day and put into a coach to take the air, and always stayed out as long as ever I could bear the motion: but what retarded the recovery of my strength more than anything was want of sleep.

At four or five o'clock every morning, after a night of broken slumbers rather than sleep, I used constantly to wake and, falling into violent and cold sweats which nothing but rising ever checked, I was obliged always to get up, or else, enfeebled by this evacuation, I used to lie in a sort of hysterical fits, drowned in sweat and floods of tears, which constantly ended in successive fits of fainting for as long as I continued in my bed.

I have often been forced, during my long stay at Naples, both before and after my fever, in these disorders, choking with vapours, and suffocated for want of breath, to have my bed curtains, the windows and doors of my bedchamber that gave upon the sea, thrown open at midnight and all hours of the day and night, in the very worst of winter weather, in order to give that immediate relief, without which I should have died.

Mr. Fox never left me night or day; I saw nobody but him and servants; he went out with me whenever I was able to go out, read to me at home when I had not spirits to talk, and constantly lay in my room. I looked so dreadfully that he has sometimes come to my bedside and doubted if I was only sleeping or dead.

His good sense made his company a constant amusement and his care never a trouble. His spirits enlivened and comforted but never overcame or oppressed me. He showed an incessant reasonable and tender concern for me, without all the fiddle-faddle impertinence of officious attention, which is often affectation, always teasing, and never useful.

As the weather grew warmer I grew stronger; but so gradually and so insensibly that though I could not feel myself every week better than the last, I never could perceive I was better to-day than yesterday, or one day than another.

As my health returned my appetite increased, with my appetite my strength, and with my strength my spirits; and as I had found out some bad consequences attending a total vegetable diet, I took this opportunity to bring my stomach again by degrees to the use of meat, after three entire years disuse of it. I began with meat of the very lightest kind, as young pig and young chicken twice a week, and in very small quantities; always both then and now observing not what was reckoned wholesome or unwholesome, in theory and in general, but what by practice and experience I found agree or disagree with my particular constitution.

By this method, and the heats of the Italian summer which I passed at Florence, I grew so strong and so well that before I left Italy I thought my entire cure was certain, though not yet completed.

A very long, painful, and dangerous operation I underwent at Florence proved my strength, but by my folly and impatience had like at once to have proved and destroyed it.

I had a lump of the kind I have already mentioned, that grew so large under my chin, at the top of my throat, that it was very ugly in appearance and not very uneasy to my feeling every time I moved my head.

For these reasons I resolved before I went to England to have it cut out; and being very impatient to return, I forced the surgeon one day, in order to hasten the cure, to put at once into the wound much more of the caustic that was to eat away the nastiness of the tumour than naturally in the common method and progress he would have done. The hole ran so deep that he was afraid of my

windpipe; and one day having teased him to sharpen the caustic (which I think was of precipitate mercury mixed with a powder) as well as to increase the quantity, the wound grew so very painful in an hour after he was gone that the anguish of it threw me into fits, and those fits deprived me so totally of all sense that, though the dressing of this wound always used to give me the most acute pain, yet when the surgeon came (who had been immediately sent for on my falling into these disorders), he opened, dressed, closed, and covered up the wound again without my ever knowing he had touched me. I seemed so entirely gone that my own *valet de chambre*, though so accustomed to seeing me faint, thought me quite dead.

However, in a few days I recovered from this shock without any other relics of the operation than a vast scar, which I still retain, but in a place where, without lifting my head, it is never seen.

I set out, immediately after the wound was healed, for England. When I came to Paris, the people who had seen me pass there the year before were astonished at the change they found in my looks, strength, and spirits; and my acquaintances in England were yet more so.

I have now been in England about two years, and have never since I came hither any fever, but once for about three days, and that by an accident that might have given one to a Sampson.

Not that I affirm my constitution to be a strong one, or that I think with all its natural dispositions, its slight make, its hereditary infirmities, and the many great and long shocks it has had, that it ever can be so. It is and always will be easily disordered, but by care, constant exercise, regularity in my diet, and what I find full as essential to my health, regularity in my hours, I live without pain and with much more constant, freer, and better spirits than those who do so much to recruit and exalt them.

It will very naturally occur to the guess of everybody who shall read these papers that I may some time or other in my life have suffered by women; but I take here occasion to declare that was never my case; and whatever hurt their commerce may have done me, by enfeebling me more when I was already weak, yet I do affirm upon my honour and truth that I never had in my life the least venereal symptom in any of my complaints.

But notwithstanding the cause of my complaints was not venereal, I was once, for those swellings in my neck, advised to try a course of mercury, and went through it; not a salivation, but a little taken every other day, and every intervening day something purgative, but neither of them strong enough to confine me at home.

I found from this course no good but some hurt. It increased the giddiness in my head, weakened my nerves, and gave me tremblings, cold sweats, and vapours. I do not mean by this to decry mercury; it is one of the best medicines in all the dispensary and one of the few among the many drugs and slops with which an apothecary's shop is stuffed that deserves the name of a medicine. It has been beneficial in many cases besides that for which it is a specific, and has mended many constitutions, though it did not happen to agree with mine. In rheumatic complaints it often relieves.

I am still subject to pain and giddiness in my head, upon any cold; from over-fatigue of any kind, either of body or mind; and from the least disorder in my stomach. Anything that vexes me much will bring it; exceeding in the quantity of my food is sure to give it me in two or three hours, be the food of what sort it will, and liquids or solids; raw fruit of any kind will give it me, though taken very sparingly, and all herbage, pulse, roots, and legumes whatever, except beans, asparagus and grains, which as I have said before agree with me and are, I believe, for everybody as wholesome nourishment as can be taken.

The reason why all the other legumes I have mentioned disagree with me I take to be this. After the first juices of nourishment are extracted, which I believe may make very good blood, that substance which remains turns all to a cold, white phlegm, that lies undigested in the stomach, hard to be carried off, presses heavy on its nerves, and by the known experienced communication of these nerves with those of the head, immediately creates the disorders there, to which I am so subject.

Milk itself, if taken unmixed with water, will have this effect on me too; but these disorders are of no other ill consequence than the immediate uneasiness they create, unless they are brought on so often as by their frequency to spoil the tone of those nerves they affect.

The most immediate, the most salutary, and the most effectual relief in these cases, when the stomach is overcharged and the head is disordered, is a vomit. Nature herself, in me at least, indicates that relief; and of all vomits I would recommend 25 or 30 grains of Indian root (as impossible to hurt), worked off with cardoons or camomile infusion taken very plentifully.

When my giddiness comes to any great height, I have always recourse to this medicine, and always find it answer. When I practised vomits most I have taken as far as 50 grains of Indian root.

For little depressions of spirits, from over-fatigue or a cold, I take

sometimes hartshorn drops, about two teaspoonfuls in a basin of warm sack whey, made very small, at going to bed, and once a week at least (oftener if I find my head or stomach uneasy), I take one of Dr. Anderson's Scotch pills, which are composed chiefly of aloes, and are the best medicine I know experimentally (for I have no other knowledge in physic) for phlegmatic constitutions and all disorders of the head, which proceed from a cold, watery slime in the stomach or bowels; the sort of indigestion people on low diets are most subject to.

I look upon these pills to be preferable to rhubarb itself, where the constitution is not subject to the piles; rhubarb to costive constitutions (which mine is and always was, even on the coolest diet) increases that complaint.

These Scotch pills and the Indian root are the only medicines I now ever deal in, unless hartshorn may be called one too.

I used formerly to take a great deal of the bark, which was certainly a most beneficial and inestimable discovery to mankind, as it is an undoubted specific for accidental ague and many sorts of intermitting fevers, but wherever agues or intermitting fevers proceed from a gross habit of body, from an exalted gall, vitiated stomach, corrupted mass of blood, or any cause that has been long contracting, though the bark will relieve, yet that relief will never be more than temporary; it will no more eradicate the disease than laudanum can eradicate the gout or stone; the one will quiet pain, and the other will postpone a fit or a fever; but both pain and fever will return, and nothing under heaven but regime, cleansing the stomach by vomits and rectifying the blood by diet, will or can effectually cure such fevers.

I have sometimes fits (of late very rarely, but two this year¹), when in perfect health and without the least warning, my eyesight failed, and immediately after I dropped down as if I was shot. These attacks I know not how to account for unless they proceed from thickness and fullness of blood; I always vomit and purge after such an attack. I bleed twice or thrice in a year at least; but that, as I grow older, will be less necessary. The blood I let is always thick, florid, and rich, and sometimes sizzly.

I am subject now and then to great pains in my breast, my shoulders, and between my shoulders, which sometimes proceed from the thickness of my blood, that hinders it circulating freely, but oftener from an overflowing of the gall; and when they do so, are relieved by a vomit, and living a day or two upon liquids.

¹ See Introduction and p. 987.

My skin often turns yellow with this complaint, and what I vomit is bitter; but I hardly ever have any disorder of this kind but from eating too much or exercising too little, which is the cause of most complaints in most people. For though time and age will bring infirmities, yet almost all distempers, I believe, originally proceed from laziness and intemperance; and as repletion is the cause, evacuation must be the remedy. There are more pains owing to the one, and curable by the other, than people are apt to imagine or willing to believe.

I have often known the toothache itself, even where the tooth was faulty, relieved by strong purges.

It might sound as odd to an ignorant incorrigible glutton's ear to prescribe a vomit for what he will call a crick in his neck, but it will often give ease sooner than rubbing it with spirits or wrapping it in flannel.

Some pains and diseases, to be sure, are got by cold, and others by infection; but even those are less frequent, less painful, less dangerous, and less lasting, in the bodies that are least gross, and the blood that is least exalted.

There is no sort of evacuation in the practice of physics that I do not approve, except blistering, and even that in lethargic cases is beneficial, but where the fever is too high (and in fevers they are oftenest applied), I think blisters augment what they are designed to palliate, as they irritate more by the poisonous particles they convey into the blood than they cool by the discharge; it is my opinion that they infuse more prejudicial matter than they extract. The strangury, which is nine times in ten the consequence of their being applied, is a proof how quick, how subtle, and how penetrating qualities they must have in their occult as well as physical operation, and the cooling emulsions given as an antidote to that consequence of them, I think prove that there must be something inflammatory in the cause. I know it may be answered by the blistering practitioners that it is the weight of the liquor prevents that effect of blisters; but if that was true, then warm sack whey or small beer would be as good a preventative as those emulsions made of the coolest seeds and infusions that an apothecary's dispensatory can furnish.

Purges, vomits, glisters, and all sorts of bleeding, are good and immediate reliefs for the head, stomach, and bowels; and for a bad habit of body issues and setons, though sometimes but slow alternatives, are never-failing aids, and often such preservatives that they are equal to a radical cure.

Those who call these things unprofitable or nasty are themselves ignorant or dirty. They may be kept as clean and made as little offensive as a cut finger, and for the benefit found from them it is as sure that many gross, flabby-nerved, corrupted habits of body, either hereditarily defective or in acquired disorders, have been relieved and mended by them, as that spongy, moist lands have by drains been brought to all the profitable fertility of a natural good soil. There are as many invalids who have grown healthy by the one as there are farmers that have grown rich by the other.

To the young they are good, preventative applications; to the diseased, good restoratives; and to the old, the best preservatives; for though nothing can quite stop the constant progressive decay of nature and her universal tendency to dissolution throughout all her productions, yet there are many things that retard and slacken her course, as there are many that forward and precipitate it; and against the approach of the most common infirmities of age, as blindness, deafness, and lameness, I look upon issues to be the most prevalent and useful, as well as the easiest and safest, remedy that can be applied. It is the only evacuation that is incessantly operating, or that can be made without any violence.

I speak from experience of issues, for I made two, one in each arm, when I was at Naples, found benefit from them whilst they were open, and two years after, when I was almost recovered, dried them up, without any bad consequences; but at that time, in order to carry off the humour that used to find vent there, I bled and purged for some months oftener than I had done just before or than I find necessary now.

So much for medicines. As to my diet, it is very low, plain, and simple; flesh once a day, chicken, pullet, lamb, pig without the skin, pheasant, or rabbit; sometimes veal, partridge, or turkey; but these three of all that can be called white meats I hold least wholesome, unless the partridge and turkey be extremely young; and once or twice a week at least I dine without meat.

I very rarely eat mutton; never if there is any of the meats at table that I have already mentioned; beef, pork, or venison I would not taste, or more than taste, upon any account. Fish I never eat; it all turns to phlegm after the first digestion is made; dispirits, and fills the stomach with wind. Shell-fish is least bad, but none is good.

Duck, teal, and pigeon are never in my bill of fare. I eat no sauce but a little parsley and butter or bread sauce, which the gluttons call pap, or a little juice of lemon or Seville orange. No pepper, no spices, the least salt imaginable, and a great deal of bread. I eat no

suppers, and for breakfast constantly green tea, and bread and butter spread very thin, for much butter is exceedingly bad for all bilious constitutions. Coffee makes my nerves tremble immediately. Bohea tea does the same or rather worse. Chocolate taken constantly would thicken my blood too much; it often, too, especially in warm weather, or after exercise, turns sour on my stomach, and anything that does so, makes me giddy as soon as things that turn to phlegm.

Almost all sweet things are apt, as I have said before, to turn sour on my stomach. However, when I am perfectly well, I can eat tart or cheesecake in small quantities without finding any ill effect. Puddings and pancakes I eat frequently.

Eggs I eat sometimes, but they are too heating to be good in great quantities; and I find them much easier of digestion boiled quite hard than any other way.

I have now done with the quality of the things I eat of, and shall say a little more as to the quantity.

I do not approve entirely Cornaro's method, who weighed everything he ate or drank, and constantly took twelve ounces of solids, and fourteen of liquids, neither more nor less every 24 hours.

All the rules he lays down in general for sobriety and abstinence are in my opinion good, well-reasoned in theory, and will, I dare say, be found experimentally true in practice. What he says, too, with regard to singularities in some constitutions, is justly and usefully observed; as for example, in his own, that new wine agreed with him better than old, and that cinnamon heated more than pepper. These were certainly particularities in his constitution contradictory to general rules; and as almost everybody has some speciality of this kind in their make, and that their own experience and observation only can discover it, in such cases they must think for themselves, and according to their own sensation adhere to or deviate from general principles.

I think Cornaro paid too scrupulous an adherence to an unchangeable quality of nourishment, and though there is nothing to be said against experience, and the particular good effect this method had on him, I do not believe it would generally answer. Both meat and drink ought in my opinion to be proportioned in some degree to thirst and hunger, and not confined entirely to weight and measure. They ought to vary with the calls of nature, and those calls will vary according to heat or cold, open or frosty weather, exercise or sitting still, rising late or early, indolence or application, being vexed or pleased, besides many other like accidental causes

which I cannot now enumerate and many more which nobody has ever discovered.

For my own part, I am so far regular in the quantity of my food that I never eat more meat in a day than the amount of a middling chicken, and fill up my meal with bread or pudding or tart or cheese in proportion to my appetite, which sometimes makes me eat more than I should, and which I am sure to feel the next day when it does; but then for that day, I eat no meat at all, and dine on bread and chicken broth or milk porridge made half of water.

My drink is water, with half a pint of which I now and then mix a spoonful of Rhenish wine; the water, if my stomach is out of order, sits easier upon it so mixed, and it is more diuretic.

I never drink any malt liquor; no wine but Rhenish or a little sack; and these not three times in a year without water.

Thus in the first place, to those who would be healthy, I recommend temperance; in the next exercise; and the next cleanliness; or more properly speaking, I recommend them all three, as the trinity in unity of health, that must co-exist and co-operate to make it perfect. They created, redeemed, and preserved, all I have to boast of. A sin against temperance in this trinity is like the sin against the Holy Ghost, and as motion is the first principle of all life, so exercise is essential to its preservation.

As to cleanliness, I think nothing more wholesome than washing with a towel and warm or cold water, all over, once a day. It promotes a free perspiration by opening the mouths of all the pores, which in dirty people are always clogged and stopped by all the collective filth which a nasty human body naturally abounds.

Flesh-brushes are good where the blood is sluggish, or the nerves weak; they quicken the one and strengthen the other.

Hot rooms and hot clothing are bad; for though perspiration is good, sweating is not. It makes people more liable to take cold; it is a medicine and not a natural state, and may therefore sometimes be necessary, but should not be too frequently used. An old rule, as I have been told, of Hippocrates was, exercise *ad ruborem sed non ad sudorem*.

The cold bath often does good, and seldom or never any hurt, where there is not some fault in the lungs.

Hot waters are admirable for a sharp or scorbutic blood, and for all cutaneous eruptions, and Bath waters for the stomach and bowels.

I can recollect nothing else that will explain what I have suffered, what I have found benefit from, what I would deny or what I would recommend.

My constitution was originally and hereditarily not a good one and not mended by my course of life when I first came into the world and commenced what I thought fine gentleman; and though, by the method I have related, I cannot say I enjoy a strong, robust, settled series of health, yet I am free from all acute pains; am very seldom ill enough to be confined; rarely want spirits; can eat more than I should; sleep sound; bear fatigue better than many fat, florid, beef and pork eaters; and never stint myself in any pleasures but those of eating and drinking and sitting up late.

But if any voracious enemy to temperance, whose only pleasure, like that of a vulture, consists in tearing dead flesh; or like that of an owl, and a modern pretty-fellow, in sitting stupid all day and rambling all night; one who has neither sense enough to discover the ill consequences of gluttony and irregularity himself nor resolution enough to avoid them when they are discovered for him; if such a one should collect passages enough out of these papers to decry what I would recommend and enable him with some plausibility to say that it is very plain, notwithstanding all my care, I was tormented with more complaints, and subject to more disorders than many people who take no care at all; all I shall give in answer to such an objection and in behalf of my own doctrine and practice will be this. That few people have recourse to this method for health till all others have failed and their constitution becomes so shattered that nothing but being new made can make it quite whole again. And though I do not pretend that this method will, like Jason's bath, turn the natural stream of time and age back to its source and restore the bloom and vigour of unimpaired youth, yet I do firmly believe whatever strength is yet remaining in any constitution it will preserve. And considering the hereditary defects of mine; how free I made with it, bad as it was, when I was very young; how late in my life I began to manage it (for I was thirty years old before I thought of management); how many, how violent, and how dangerous the complaints were with which I was to struggle; how tottering and how crazy the building was I had to prop; all these things, I say, considered, I do think, and everybody who saw me five years ago will own, it is next to a miracle that I now exist at all.

But if it shall further be urged that an existence on the disagreeable terms I have it is not worth preserving, I shall imagine those who advance that sentiment either say what they do not think, or think differently in speculation from what they would do if it came to the trial; for when the only option lies between such an existence as I

have described or no existence at all, those who say they would not jump at the first either speak without considering and at their ease, and will change their note whenever they come to be sick; or they must be such people as have a much stronger passion for eating and drinking, and much more indifference to many other pleasures to be found in living than I pretend to, or desire to arrive at.

The following opinion on Lord Hervey's health, from the facts available in the above "Account" and other documents, has been obtained from Sir Henry Head, M.D., F.R.S.

Lord Hervey's account of his own health would form a valuable subject for a treatise on the medicine of the period.

But, like all such accounts, it is almost impossible to discover the relevant facts for diagnosis amongst the mass of detail concerning the drastic treatment of the day and its supposed results.

Evidently, however, Lord Hervey must have suffered from some affection of the gall-bladder, probably gall-stones. This would account for the violent pains around the body and lower part of the chest, coming on paroxysmally, and apparently followed by jaundice.

With regard to the loss of his teeth,¹ we are not told at what age this occurred, but I should strongly suspect that he suffered from pyorrhoea, probably aggravated by the course of mercury he underwent. He specifically states that this was not pushed to salivation as was customary even up to quite modern times, but he probably took quite enough mercury to loosen his teeth, provided the gums were previously affected.

The nature of the "fits" is more difficult to determine, since he himself evidently had the idea that they were epileptic and maintained secrecy with regard to their nature and frequency of occurrence, except in his letters to Fox.

They certainly resembled epileptiform attacks in the suddenness of onset and apparently complete loss of consciousness, accompanied by falling. There seems to have been no biting of the tongue and no obvious convulsion. Such attacks, occurring at infrequent intervals, are not uncommon in otherwise normal men. Some of these patients suffer from two or three attacks only throughout the whole course of their lives.

These "fits" were certainly *not* hysterical in origin, and are completely different from the emotional disturbance which he mentions as sometimes following an unusually severe bout of pain.

¹ This refers to the Duchess of Marlborough's description of Lord Hervey in 1737, in which she states that he has "a painted face and not a tooth in his head."

INDEX

The pages of the volumes are numbered straight through. Volume I contains pages 1-314; Volume II, pages 315-648; Volume III, pages 649-988.

- Abingdon, Montagu Venables Bertie, and Earl of (d. 1743), 428
- Addison, Joseph (1672-1719), 845-6
- Anderson, Dr. (d. 1635), 981
- Anglesey, Arthur Annesley, 5th Earl of (d. 1737), 430, 432
- Anne, Queen, 69
- Arbuthnot, John (1667-1735), xviii, 973
- Archbishop of Canterbury, *see under Wake and Potter*
- Argyll, John Campbell, 2nd Duke of (1680-1743), li, 44, 135, 139, 143, 175, 245-6, 246-7, 536, 540, 592-4, 673, 706-8, 711, 719-20, 723, 736-8, 740, 855, 925
- Ashurst, Ben, mot on Lord Chesterfield, 72
- Attorney General (Sir John Willes, M.P.) (1685-1761), 418
- Augusta, H.R.H. Princess (Duchess of Brunswick) (1737-1813), 759 *et seq.*, 802, 805-7, 836, 875
- Aylesford, Heneage Finch, 2nd Earl of (1683-1757), on Lord Carteret, 739
- Backenswants, John, a groom at the Palace, 581
- Balchen, Admiral Sir John (1670-1744) 926-7, 929, 935-6, 940
- Baltimore, Charles Calvert, 5th Baron, M.P. (1699-1751), 476-82, 632, 666, 691-2, 817, 821-3, 835, 850
- Barnard, Sir John, M.P. (1685-1764), 166, 168, 726, 729
- Barrington, John Shute, 1st Viscount (1678-1734), 130
- Bateman, Anne, Lady (d. 1769), 850
- Bathurst, Allen Bathurst, 1st Baron (first Earl) (1684-1775), 431-2, 538, 699
- Bean, Miss (Mrs. Dodington) (d. 1756), 477
- Beauclerk, Lord Vere (1st Baron Vere) (1699-1781), 939
- Bedford, John Russell, 4th Duke of (1710-1771), 246-7, 423-4, 567, 699, 838
- Behn, Mrs., Queen's underservant, 580
- Bellenden, Hon. Mary (d. 1736), character and relations with George II, 41-2
- Benson, Martin, Bishop of Gloucester (1689-1752), 405
- Bentley, Richard (1662-1742), 511
- Berkeley, Hon. George, M.P. (1693-1746) and Pulteney, 8; marries Lady Suffolk, 471
- Berkeley, James Berkeley, 3rd Earl of (1680-1736), dismissal, 37-8; and project of deporting George II, 849
- Berkshire, Henry Bowes Howard, 4th Earl of (1687-1757), 699; windows broken by Prince of Wales, 309, 866
- Berkshire, Countess of, 309, 866
- Bernstorff, Andreas Gottlieb von (1649-1726), 38
- Berwick, James Fitzjames, Duke of (1671-1734), 212, 219, 328, 330-1
- Bloodworth, Thomas, equerry to Prince of Wales, 758
- Boileau (1636-1711), quoted, 71, 151
- Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, 1st Viscount (1678-1751), xxvii, 161, 171, 183; relations with Pulteney, 8, 256; career and character, 9-17; and Wyndham, 19-20, 529; abhorred by George II, 39; manages Lord Essex's affairs, 96; Queen's opinion of, 142; as a writer, 263, 755-6; opinions on Walpole's foreign policy, 464, 517; intrigues with French Ambassador and Government, 520, 529 π ; leaves England, 529
- Bolton, Charles Powlett, 3rd Duke of (1685-1754), 135, 175-6, 205, 245-6, 707, 925

- Bourbon, Duc de (1692-1740), xvii, 61, 63
- Bowyer, Miss, friend of Miss Bean's, 477
- Bridgeman, Charles (d. 1738), 487
- Bridgewater, Scroop Egerton, 1st Duke of (1681-1745), 699
- Brinkman, George (d. 1742), George II's valet de chambre, 920
- Bristol, Augustus John Hervey, 3rd Earl of (1724-1779), xi, 448 n, 585
- Bristol, George William Hervey, 2nd Earl of (1721-1775), xxix
- Bristol, Frederick Augustus Hervey, 4th Earl of (1730-1804), xxxvi
- Bristol, Frederick William Hervey, 1st Marquess of (1769-1859), mutilates the *Memoirs*, xi-xiv
- Bristol, John Hervey, 1st Earl of (1665-1751), 532; career, xiv; protests against his wife's upbringing of Hervey, xv; applies to George II to provide for Hervey, xxi; offers an allowance to Hervey, xxvi, 104-5, 108, 110; Queen and Hervey on, 817-20; Hervey's letters to, 942-59
- Bristol, Elizabeth, Countess of (1676-1741), xiv-xvi, xlvii-viii, 380, 817-20, 963
- Brogie, Marshal, François Marie, Comte de (1671-1745), 329-30, 520-1
- Broxholme, Noel, M.D. (1689-1748), 778, 781, 879
- Brudenell, Mrs., Queen's Bedchamber woman, 576, 882
- Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, August Wilhelm, Duke of (1662-1731), and George I's will, xxxv-vi, 28
- Buccleugh, Francis Scott, 2nd Duke of (1695-1751), 423
- Buckingham, Catherine, Duchess of (1681-1743), leaves Hervey Buckingham House, lvi; windows broken by Prince of Wales, 308-9, 865-6
- Burlington, Richard Boyle, 3rd Earl of (1695-1753), 188-9, 574, 584
- Burlington, Dorothy, Countess of (1699-1758), 188-9, 574, 583-4, 587-90
- Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury (1643-1715), *History of My Own Times* quoted 2, 72
- Busier, Paul, 890, 892
- Bute, James Stuart, 3rd Earl of (1713-1792), liv
- Butler, Joseph (Bishop of Durham) (1692-1752), 908
- Butts, Robert, Bishop of Norwich (1684-1748), relation with Hervey, 532-3, 541, 741
- Cadogan, William, 1st Earl (1675-1726), 57
- Cambis, Louis-Dominique, Comte de (d. 1740), French Ambassador, 878
- Campbell, Colonel John (4th Duke of Argyll) (1693-1770), 41
- Campbell, John, of Calder, M.P. (d. 1770), 451-3
- Cannons, Mrs., a midwife, 749, 757, 776, 778, 781
- Cardigan, George Brudenell, 4th Earl of (*cr.* D. of Montagu) (1712-1790), 699
- Carestini, Giovanni (1705-1758-60), 309
- Carnarvon, Henry Brydges, Marquess of (2nd Duke of Chandos) (1708-1771), 298, 783-5, 850; George II on, 817
- Caroline, Queen (1683-1737), xi, xxv, xxxvii-xlii, lvii-viii, 99, 204, 245, 318, 454-5, 647, 737, 837-8, 846-9, 944; relations with Frederick, Prince of Wales, *see under* Prince of Wales; and with Hervey, *see under* Hervey; and with George II, *see under* George II; and Madame de Villette, 10-11; at accession of George II, 22-3, 25; supports Walpole, 30, 32-3, 39, 47-9, 151-3, 177; her jointures and allowance, 35, 686, 689-90; Coronation, 66; relations with Mrs. Clayton (Lady Sundon), 66-8, 605-8; lampooned, 68-70; at scene between Walpole and Townshend, 86-7; relations with Sherlock, 89, 294-5, 410-11, 534-5, 540-8, 652, 682-3, 719-20, 852; and with Mrs. Howard (Lady Suffolk), 40-1, 43, 93-4, 169, 177, 381-4, 471-4; Regent (1729), 102, (1735), 457, 469-70, (1736), 555-7, 568-9; Pulteney on, 105, 107; conferences, etc., with Hoadly, 123-30, 190-2, 395-9; and with Lord Stair, 136-45, 288-9; anxiety over excise bill, 149-50, 155-8, 161-2, 165, 169-70; burnt in effigy, 166; displeased at government defeats in Parliament, 197, 417, 419-20, 434-5; prejudiced in favour of the Emperor, 218, 227, 342-62, 376-8, 446, 517; on Prince of Orange, 231-2, 271-2; on Lord King, 244; on Lord Scarborough, 249, 750; her sacrifice of pleasure to power, 253-5, 261-3, 457; love of troops, 257-8,

524-6; at Princess Royal's marriage, 264, 266, 268-70; supports Handel, 273; dislike of Chesterfield, 278-80, 411; her unpopularity, 281-2; affection for Princess Royal, 289, 368-72, 389-92, 422-3; anxiety as to elections, 222, 291-5; on Whigs and Tories, 292-4, 680-2; relations with Lord Ilay and Duke of Argyll, 296-7, 718-21, 854-6; and with Lord Harrington, 346, 494-5; minor illnesses, 372-6, 392, 804; dislike of Lady Portland, 406; and Prince of Wales's marriage, 408, 474-5, 505-6, 549-54; relations with Carteret, 410-11, 524, 696, 702-3, 752-5, 789-90, 826-7; on Miss Skerret and Walpole, 421; greeting from King on his return from Hanover, 484, 649; on the British constitution, 486-8; suffers from King's ill-humour, 488-93, 496-504, 527-8, 539, 574; and King's love affairs, 457-9, 506-8, 560, 597-608, 743; on Triple Alliance, 514-5; dislike of French Ambassador, 522-4; and Bishop Hare, 542-3; on Princess of Wales, 564-5, 807; and Porteous riots, 571-4, 660, 707, 709-11, 716, 718-20, 723, 725-6; letters to George II, 573, 597, 600-1, 641; decides to stay on at Kensington, 608-9, 621; doubts whether Prince of Wales's marriage consummated, 614-18; attitude towards King's return, 623-4, 639; fears for his safety, 631-40; comment on his letter, 642; his affectionate behaviour to her, 649-52; displeased at Walpole's style of talking, 655-8; and Prince of Wales's application to Parliament, 661-5, 667, 669-84, 691-2, 695, 700-5, 769-72; opposes scheme for conversion of national debt, 726-7, 731-2; on Horace Walpole, 732; on Duke of Newcastle, 732-3; and censorship of plays, 738-9; and Lady Deloraine, 745-8; and accouchement of Princess of Wales, 749-50, 756-7, 759-91, 814-5; her visit to Princess of Wales, 793; attitude towards scheme for separating Hanover and England, 795-802, 855-7; settles message expelling Prince of Wales from St. James's, 806, 808-9, 811-12; discusses Lord and Lady Bristol, 817-20; correspondence with Prince and Princess of Wales, 821-6, 831-6, 841-5; her readiness to think ill of people,

827-8; illness and death, 877-917; speculations as to her successor, 918-24
 Caroline, H.R.H. Princess (1713-1757), 272, 371, 378-9, 382, 392, 423, 483, 490, 503, 552, 563, 585-7, 595, 627, 647, 650, 654-6, 690, 753, 756, 759-60, 763, 765, 804, 819, 828, 857, 878-83, 888-9, 892-6, 899, 908, 915, 919-20; character, xxxviii, 275-6; relations with Hervey, 1, 305, 621; on Prince of Wales, xxx-xxxi, 618, 628-9, 643, 671, 774-5, 791-2, 812-3; and Lady Deloraine, 746-7; on Lord Carteret, 790; her ill health, 880-1, 883, 893, 924
 Carteret, John, Lord (Earl Granville) (1690-1763), 144, 151, 170, 199, 246, 256, 263, 367, 409, 436, 524, 538, 667, 779, 821-2; dismissed from Lord Lieutenantcy of Ireland, 119-20; Queen's opinion of, 142; compared to Lord Chesterfield, 411-12; on Preliminaries of Vienna, 517; and Porteous riots inquiry, 659-60, 705-6, 721-2, 724-5; courts the Queen, 410, 682, 702-3, 739, 752-4, 789-90, 826-7; speech on Prince of Wales's allowance, 696-7; relations with Duke of Newcastle, 701, 733, 940; said to be writing his *Memoirs*, 752, 754-6; relations with Prince of Wales, 836-7, 850-1; and Hervey's dismissal, 943-5, 947, 949-50, 952-9
 Castinetti, Admiral, 52
 Cathcart, Charles, 8th Baron (1686-1740), 933, 941
 Cavendish, Admiral, 939
 Cavendish, Lord Charles, M.P., 162
 Cavendish, Lord James, M.P., 162
 Cerillo, an Italian doctor, 977
 Chandos, James Brydges, 1st Duke of (1673-1744), xlii-iii
 Charitable Corporation, 142, 185, 186, 365
 Charles I, George II on, 69
 Charles II, George II on, 69
 Chauvelin, Germain Louis (1685-1762), 466, 524
 Chavigny, Théodore de (1687-1771), 228, 284, 331, 391; his indiscreet conduct, 519-24
 Chesterfield, Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4th Earl of (1694-1773), 247, 410, 495, 595-6, 699; admiration for Lady Hervey, xvi-xvii; relations with Pulteney, 8, 651-2; appearance and character, 71-4, 411-12, 755; Lord

- Steward, 119; opposes Excise Bill, 135, 176; dismissal, 172-7, 188; as a writer, 263, 755-6; and the Queen, 278-80, 306; and Prince of Wales, 256, 299-302, 304, 386-7, 505, 613, 619, 667, 779, 788-9, 821, 836, 845, 850; sells Carlton House to Prince of Wales, 311, 876; speeches, 431, 436, 538, 738; lampoons on George II, 651-2
- Cheyne, George, M.D. (1671-1743), Hervey's doctor, xviii-xx, 968-71, 973
- Cholmondeley, George, 3rd Earl of (Lord Malpas, M.P.) (1703-1770), 30, 37, 96, 204, 425, 452, 659
- Christianity, no longer believed in England, 92
- Churchill, General Charles, M.P. (d. 1745), xxiv-v, 18, 28, 164
- City of London, opposes excise bill, 134, 156, 160, 204 n; address on Princess Royal's wedding, 280-1; freedom of, presented to Prince of Wales, 625, 627-8; congratulation of the Prince on birth of a daughter, 836-7
- Clark, Dr. Alured (1696-1742), 796
- Clarke, Mr., 590
- Clavering, Mrs., dresser to Princess of Wales, 758
- Clayton, Mr., equerry to George II, 634
- Clayton, Mrs., *see under* Sundon
- Clinton, Hugh Fortescue, 14th Baron (1696-1751), 135, 160, 172, 177
- Clutterbuck, Thomas, M.P. (d. 1742), 451-3, 455
- Cobham, Sir Richard Temple, Viscount (1675-1749), opposes excise bill, 136, 176; deprived of his regiment, 200, 245, 247, 707; his nephews, 386-7, 553
- Coke, Thomas (d. 1727), Vice-Chamberlain to George I, 846-7, 922
- Compton, Sir Spencer, *see under* Wilmington
- Condé, Prince de (1621-1686), 144
- Cornaro, Louis (1467-1566), 984
- Cornwallis, John, M.P., Equerry to Prince of Wales, 838-9
- Coventry, William, 7th Earl of (c. 1688-1751), 699
- Cowper, Mrs., 632
- Coxe, William (1747-1828), lx
- Craftsman, The*, 68, 142, 235, 260, 263, 501
- Crawford, John, 13th Earl of (1702-1749), 712
- Croker, John Wilson (1780-1857), edits *Memoirs*, xi-xiii; quoted, lviii-ix
- Cumberland, H.R.H. William Augustus, Duke of (1721-1765), xxxiii, 106, 345, 617, 627, 689-90, 760, 884, 931; partiality of King and Queen for, 767; Hanover as an apanage for, 795, 797, 857; Prince of Wales on, 828; Queen's last words to, 895
- Cunningham, Henry, M.P., 165
- Dacier, André (1651-1722), 511
- Decker, Sir Matthew, Bart., M.P. (1679-1749), 13
- Delaware, John West, 1st Earl (1693-1766), 274, 548-9, 659, 713
- d'Elitz, Madame (d. 1773), 558-9
- Deloraine, Mary, Countess Dowager of (1700-1744), xxxix; her retort to Hervey, xxiii; governess to younger Princesses, 379; relations with the King, 491, 498, 743-8, 840, 853, 919-20
- Denmark, Charlotte Amelia, Princess of (b. 1706), considered for wife of Prince of Wales, 505, 813-4
- Derwentwater Estate, 186, 364
- Devonshire, William Cavendish, 2nd Duke of (1675-1729), character, 24
- Devonshire, William Cavendish, 3rd Duke of (1698-1755), 173, 188-9, 205, 425, 548, 621, 635, 653, 673, 925
- Dion Cassius, xlv n, 309, 863, 865-7, 869, 871, 873, 875
- Dissenters, *see under* Ecclesiastical affairs
- Dives, Miss, maid of honour, 627
- Dodington, George Bubb, M.P. (Lord Melcombe) (1691-1762), supplants Hervey in favour of Prince of Wales, xxxix, xli; his diary, lix; relations with Walpole, 29, 176, 454, 653; relations with Prince of Wales, 176, 205, 233, 255-6, 286, 301-2, 304, 312, 385-8, 477, 619, 876
- Dorset, Duchess of, 22
- Dorset, Lionel Cranfield Sackville, 1st Duke of (1688-1765), 44, 119, 174-5, 295, 454-5, 925, 930; Walpole's opinion of his conduct, 653-4
- Douglas, Dr. James (1675-1742), 422, 589
- Drost, the Queen's coachman, 582
- Dubois, Cardinal (1656-1723), 524
- Dudley, Lady, 615
- Duke, The, *see under* Cumberland
- Dundonald, Thomas Cochrane, 6th Earl of (1702-1737), 423

Dunmore, John Murray, 2nd Earl of (1685-1752), Lord of the Bedchamber to George II, 656-7, 802

Dunoyer, M., dancing master to royal family, 757, 791-2, 836, 867

Dysart, Grace, Countess of (1713-1755), 850

Earle, Giles, M.P. (1678-1758), character, 740

Ecclesiastical affairs, episcopal promotions, 88-93, 394-405, 543-48, 652-3; Dissenters and repeal of Test and Corporation Acts, 121-132, 530-1, 794-5; Mortmain and Quakers Bills, 530-43

Edwin, Lady Charlotte (1703-1776), 594, 850

Effingham, Countess of, Lady in waiting to Princess of Wales, 838

Egmont, John Percival, 1st Earl of (1683-1748), his diary, lxi

Emily, H.R.H. Princess (1711-86), xxxviii, 272, 381-2, 392, 423, 490, 585-9, 595, 627, 690, 759-60, 765, 828; 878-9, 881-3, 888-9, 893, 895, 907, 915; character, 275-6; relations with Hervey, 275, 621, 791; relations with her family, 305, 621, 791; relations with Duke of Newcastle, 654-5, 831; indiscretion, 667; and Lady Deloraine, 746; on the King, 913-14; position and prospects on death of the Queen, 918-20, 924

Erskine, Charles, M.P. (Solicitor-General for Scotland) (1680-1763), 721

Essex, William Capel, 3rd Earl of (1697-1743), 96-7, 219, 760, 762-3, 777, 780-1, 784-5, 841

Eugene, Prince (1663-1736), 57, 315, 330-3, 337-8

Evelyn, John, M.P., 851

Excise bill, 132 *et seq.*

Falmouth, Hugh Boscawen, 1st Viscount (1680-1734), 172, 188, 288

Fane, Charles, M.P. (2nd Viscount Fane) (d. 1766), 830

Farinelli, Carlo Broschi (1705-1802), 309, 372, 615

Finch, William, M.P. (d. 1766), 367

Findlater, James Ogilvy, 5th Earl of (1689-1764), 712

Fitzroy, Lord Augustus (1716-1741), 634

Fitzwilliam, Miss, xxiii

Fleury, Cardinal (1653-1743), xxxv, 31, 61-3, 77, 78, 464-6, 511, 513; opinion of Horace Walpole, 284

Fog's Journal, 576

Foreign Affairs, at accession of George II, 49-65; on conclusion of Treaty of Seville, 110-18; war of Polish Succession, 209-29, 315-19, 325-40, 459-69, 508-19; Spanish depredations in West Indies, 853-4

Fox, Henry, M.P. (1st Lord Holland) (1705-1774), xxii, xxix, liii-iv, lix, 661, 668-9, 740-1, 768, 851, 902

Fox, Stephen, M.P. (1st Earl of Ilchester) (1704-1776), accompanies Hervey to Italy, xxii, 974, 977-8; Hervey's affection for him, xxii-xxiv, xxxvi, 661, 973-4; letters to him, xxiv-v, xxviii-ix, xlv; Hervey presses his claims on Walpole, 453-5, 667-9, 740-1

France, King of (Louis XV) (1710-1774), character, 61-2

Freind, John, M.D. (1675-1728), 967

Gage, Thomas Hall, 1st Viscount, M.P. (d. 1754), 265

Gay, John (1685-1732), his poem referring to Hervey and Miss Lepel, xvi; banning of *Polly*, 98-9

George I (1660-1727), xv, xxi, 22, 37-8, 49, 51, 59, 61, 559; and Bolingbroke, 11-16; suppression of will, xxxiv-vi, 27-8, 839-40; George II on, 69, 918; quarrel with George II, xxxi-ii, 845-9

George II (1683-1760), xxi, xxiv-v, xlvii, xlix-l, 99, 101, 188, 202-4, 244-7, 264, 275, 318, 326, 335-6, 451-2, 454, 563, 573-4, 612; relations with Frederick, Prince of Wales, *see under* Prince of Wales; accession, 22-6; suppresses George I's will, xxxiv-vi, 27-8; decides not to change ministers, 29-35, 65-6; reasons, 45-9; summer residences, 79, 205, 291, 297, 743, 752; relations with Lady Suffolk, 39-44, 93-4, 379-85, 471-4; Queen's influence over, 39, 41, 43-5, 48-9, 68-70, 84, 139, 151-3, 177, 242, 253-5, 291, 361, 373-5, 457-9, 597-8; lampoons on, 69-70, 610-11, 651-2; and Chesterfield, 71-2, 280, 755; visits Hanover, (1729) 102; Pulteney on, 105-7; and excise bill, 148-177; opinion of Walpole, 153, 177-8, 493, 517, 649; lack of political courage, 168, 434, 507; on Whigs and

Tories, 170, 682-3; and government defeats in Parliament, 190, 197, 417; and Princess Royal, 192-196, 266, 271, 289, 370-2, 390-2, 423, 624, 902; unpopularity, 207-9, 281-2, 638-9, 646; views on foreign affairs, 217-21, 224-7, 340-8, 355, 358-61, 368, 376-8, 393-4, 517; and general election of 1733, 222-4, 291-7; treatment of Prince of Orange, 230-1, 282-3; affection for Lord Scarborough, 248-9, 750; his unyielding disposition, 250-3, 406-7, 556-7, 646, 668, 702; love of troops, 257-8, 445-6, 525; contempt for letters and learning, 261; supports Handel, 273-4; Princess Royal on, 276-8, 332; unwillingness to admit to illness, 372-3; listens to a conference between Queen and Walpole, 379; dislike of Hoadly, 395, 398-9, 498-500; decides to marry Prince of Wales, 408, 474, 505-6, 548-55; on Carteret, 411, 755, 789-90; goes to Hanover (1735), 455-6; and Madame Walmoden, 457-9, 506-8, 538-9, 557-60, 743, 852-3, 918-20; letters to Queen, 458, 471, 560, 602-4, 613, 641-2; and Duchess of Modena, 458-9; refuses command of Imperial Army on the Rhine, 467-8; signs commissions at Hanover, 470, 556-7; return, illness and ill humour, 484-94, 496-503, 527-8; and Lady Deloraine, 498, 744-8, 853, 919-20; and French Ambassador, 522-4; goes to Hanover (1736), 555; protracted stay, 597-609; popular discontent at, 609-11; return and danger of, 623-49; good humour, 649-51; illness, 656-8, 662-3, 669-70; and Prince of Wales's application to Parliament, 663-7, 670-93; dissatisfied with Walpole's handling of, 694-5, 700-1, 769-72; personal control of military affairs, 707-8, 771-2; opposes scheme for converting national debt, 726-7; his unamiability, 750-2; and accouchement of Princess of Wales, 756, 759-60, 763-4, 766-8, 776-86; comment on Queen's reception by Prince of Wales, 793; expulsion of Prince of Wales from St. James's, 693, 770-2, 786-8, 806-17, 820-6, 831-45; and separation of England and Hanover, xxxiii-iv, 795-802, 855-7; and christening of Prince's daughter, 802-3, 805-6; on shortage of suitable Pro-

testant Princesses, 813-4; on Prince's entourage, 816-7; his quarrel with George I, xxxi-ii, 845-9; and Queen's illness and death, 878-924; goes to Hanover (1740), 928, 936, 941; and marriage of Princess Mary, 930-2; and Hervey's dismissal, lv-vi, 942-58
George III (1738-1820), xxxi, xxxiv, liv
Gibbon, Edward (1737-1794), on Lady Hervey, xvi
Gibson, Edmund, Bishop of London (1669-1748), 583, 930-2; Walpole's adviser in church matters, 90-1, 295, 410-11; and Bishopric of Gloucester, 399-405; opposes Mortmain and Quakers Bills, 531-6, 540-4; motives, 544-6; passed over for Canterbury, 653
Godolphin, Francis, 2nd Earl of (1678-1766), lii, 405-8, 451, 548, 759, 768-9, 837
Godolphin, Francis (1st Baron Godolphin) (1706-1785), 406
Godolphin, Sidney, 1st Earl of (1645-1712), 9, 407
Gower, John, 1st Earl (1694-1754), 428, 942, 951
Grafton, Charles Fitzroy, 2nd Duke of (1683-1757), xxv, li-ii, 98-9, 172-3, 189, 217, 264-6, 274, 281, 345, 548, 553, 572, 574, 583-4, 592, 595-6, 611, 621, 634-5, 654, 656, 673, 760, 762-3, 765, 786, 802, 805, 814-6, 820, 883, 899, 918, 925, 930; George II on, 266, 494
Gramont, Philibert, Comte de (1621-1707), 551
Grantham, Henry d'Auverquerque, 1st Earl of (1672-1754), 288-9, 345, 373, 583, 590-1, 593, 596, 822-3, 831, 847, 877
Grenville, Richard (1st Earl Temple) (1711-1779), xxix, 553, 667
Grovestein, M., 370
Haddock, Admiral Nicholas, M.P. (1686-1746), 926-7, 934-5, 937
Halifax, George Montague, 4th Earl of (c. 1685-1739), 164
Halifax, George Savile, 1st Marquess of (1633-1695), Lord Chesterfield compared to, 72
Hamilton, Lord Archibald, M.P. (1674-1754), 475, 743
Hamilton, Lady Archibald (c. 1700-1752), relations with Prince of Wales, 475-7, 554, 563, 849-51; her reply to the

- Queen, 762; on the Prince's conduct during the Queen's illness, 902; 661, 758, 761, 778, 792-3, 836
- Hamilton, Hon. Charles (1704-1786), 661, 902
- Hamilton and Brandon, James, 5th Duke of (1703-1743), 423, 475
- Hamilton, Dowager Duchess of (1681-1744), 594-5
- Handel, George Frederick (1685-1759), 273-4, 371, 600
- Hanmer, Sir Thomas, M.P. (1677-1746), 78-9
- Harcourt, Simon, 1st Viscount (1661-1727), 85
- Harcourt, Simon, 2nd Viscount (1st Earl) (1714-1777), 748
- Hardwicke, Philip Yorke, 1st Earl of (1690-1764), 278, 424, 470, 568, 591, 673, 759, 892-3, 925, 928, 938, 949; on quarrel in royal family, xxxi, xxxiii; Hervey's relations with him, li-iii; created Lord Chief Justice, 242-3; Lord Chancellor, 659; on Mortmain and Quakers Bills, 536-7; and Prince of Wales, 675-6, 786-7, 809-10, 827; speech on Prince's allowance, 697; in debates on Porteous Riots, 706, 709, 711-12, 714-15, 719, 721-3, 725; connection with Duke of Newcastle, 700-1, 708, 716, 829
- Hare, Francis, Bishop of St. Asaph, then of Chichester (1671-1740), 294, 583; character, 88-9; writer for Court, 263; complains to Queen of Hervey's behaviour, 540, 542-3; Walpole inclines to, as Archbishop of Canterbury, 547-8, 652
- Harrington, William Stanhope, 1st Earl of (1683-1756), xxiii, 78, 99, 100, 111, 118-19, 130-1, 355, 393, 507, 634, 659, 673, 768, 925, 929-30, 932, 935; character and reputation, 174, 345-6, 579, 583, 593; a putative father of Miss Vane's child, xxxix, 290; courts the King at Hanover, 470, 494; behaviour to Walpole, 495-6; not allowed to go again to Hanover, 556; Prince's declaration to him regarding the Princess's accouchement, 765-6, 777-8, 782, 834-6, 841-2
- Hatolf, Hanoverian minister in England, 342-3, 394, 446
- Hedges, John, M.P. (d. 1737), Prince of Wales's treasurer, 233; composes speeches and poem for Prince, 309, 867; his loan of £6000 to the Prince, 312, 876; advises Prince against applying to Parliament, 666, 704; makes a declaration on behalf of Prince in House of Commons, 691-2; death, 805
- Henry V, xxxii
- Herbert, Henry Arthur, M.P. (Earl of Powis) (1703-1772), treasurer to Prince of Wales, 805, 850-1
- Herbert, Mrs., bedchamber woman to Queen, 881-3
- Hertford, Algernon Seymour, 7th Earl of (7th Duke of Somerset) (1684-1750), 419
- Hertford, Countess of, 419
- Hervey, Lady Ann (1707-1771), 967
- Hervey, Lord Arthur Charles (Bishop of Bath and Wells) (1808-1894), xi, xiii
- Hervey, Lady Barbara (1709-1727), 967
- Hervey, Lady Elizabeth (1697-1727), xxi-xxii, 967, 971-4
- Hervey, John, Lord (1696-1743), 114, 155, 219-20, 231-4, 250, 267, 271, 279, 326, 365, 373, 410, 491, 505, 507, 553, 572, 600, 613, 635, 705, 737, 750-2, 789, 806, 811, 823-4, 831, 837, 852-3, 855-6, 917; parentage and youth, xiv-xv; marriage, xvi-xviii; enters Parliament, xviii; ill-health, xviii-xxi, 961-87; breakdown and visit to Italy, xxi-ii; relations with Stephen Fox, xxii-iv; fits, xxiv-v; relations and quarrel with Pulteney, xxv-xxx, 8, 103-10, 684-5, 790-1; and with the Prince of Wales, xiv, xv, xxiv-v, xxxvi-xlii, 207, 274-5, 277, 290, 302-4, 307, 309, 614-7, 619, 671, 753, 774-5, 812, 867; and with Pope, xlii-xlvi; favour and intimacy with the Queen, xlvii-1, 221-2, 274-5, 348-9, 354, 435, 498, 503, 528, 540, 574-5, 621, 640-1, 804, 809-10, 820, 840, 844-5; appointed Lord Privy Seal, l-liv; illness and death, liv-vii; relations with Walpole, 28, 32-3, 103, 107-10, 156-7, 364-5, 773-4, 809-10, 920-4; resigns pension, 109-10; speeches in Parliament, lvi, 115 n, 165, 237-41, 425-34, 436-45, 449 n, 536, 711, 714, 717, 721; pamphlets, lvi, 117-8, 245, 531; reports excise bill debates to King and Queen, 143-5, 148-53, 156-62, 169-70; mobbed with Walpole, 164-5; friendship with Hoadly, 191-2, 395-9, 499-500; drafts a King's speech, 200-3; created a peer, 204; discusses royal family with Walpole, 205-9,

625-7, 642, 650-1, 827, 903-5; supports Walpole's foreign policy, 217, 221, 227, 344, 349-54, 361-2; advises King and Queen as to state of public opinion, 222-7, 524-5; responsible for ceremonial of Princess Royal's wedding, 264-6; relations with Princess Royal and Prince of Orange, 272, 289-91; relations with the Princesses, 275-8, 621; defends the Whigs, 292-3; supports Walpole's interest at Court, 294-5, 420-1; discussions with Queen on Prince of Wales, 300-7, 561-2, 564, 614-21, 627-33, 640, 644-6, 662-5, 677-84, 785-7, 790, 795-7, 803-5, 812-13, 816-7, 828, 832-4, 839-40, 843-4; discusses foreign affairs with Walpole, 376-9; resumed relations with Miss Vane, 388-9, 477-83; presses claims of his friends on Walpole, 451-5, 667-9, 740-1; ordered by King to replace pictures, 488-90; summoned to entertain King and Queen in evenings, 498-503, 528; Walpole's advice to him if he becomes Prime Minister, 526-7; attacks the Bishops, 531-6, 540-3; urges Walpole to appoint Potter to Canterbury, 546-8; his poem and play, 575-96; alarmed at Queen's attitude towards the King's love affair, 597-9, 601-3; friendship for Lady Sundon, 605-8, 753-4; discussion with Queen on consummation of Frederick's marriage, 614-21; warns Walpole that he is giving offence to Queen, 657-8; learns of Frederick's intention to apply to Parliament, 661-2; hostility to Duke of Newcastle, 669, 700-1, 708, 716, 733-4, 827, 829, 886; Walpole informs him of intention to make concessions to Frederick, 672-3; conduct in Porteous Riots debates, 707-12, 714-26; attitude towards scheme for converting national debt, 731-2; dialogue with and bon mot on Lady Deloraine, 744, 747-8; accompanies Queen to St. James's on accouchement of Princess of Wales, 759-68; discussion with King and Queen on probable merits of memoirs by Bolingbroke, Carteret and Chesterfield 755-6; urges Walpole to take extreme measures against Frederick, 769-74, 786; discussions with Queen and Walpole on project of separating England and Hanover, 795-801; drafts message expelling Frederick from St. James's,

807-8; discusses his parents with Queen, 817-20; arranges and translates Frederick's correspondence with King and Queen, 821, 841-5; amends Walpole's draft reply to Princess of Wales, 825-6; his paper comparing Frederick to Nero, 857-77; in Queen's apartment throughout her last illness, 877-915; his situation at Court, 920-4; notes of Cabinet meetings, 925-41; letters to Lord Bristol on his own dismissal, 942-59
 Hervey, Hon. Lepel (Lady Mulgrave) (1722-1780), lvi
 Hervey, Mary, Lady (1700-1768), xi, xxv, xlii, 397, 477, 651, 685; marriage and character, xvi-xviii; plans that Hervey shall join opposition, xxvi, 103-4, 107
 Hervey, Hon. Thomas (1699-1775), 204, 741, 967
 Hervey, Capt. the Hon. William, R.N. (1699-1776), 926
 Hervey, General William (1732-1815), and manuscript of Memoirs, xi-xiii, 837 n; his resemblance to FitzFrederick Vane, 614
 Hinton, John Poulett, Lord (2nd Earl Poulett) (1708-1764), 242, 542-3, 830
 Hoadly, Benjamin, Bishop of Salisbury, then of Winchester (1676-1761), 404; attitude towards repeal of Test Act, 123-9, 794-5; sent for by Queen, 190-2; writes for government, 263; translation to Winchester, 395-9, 547; George II on, 498-500
 Hoadly, John (1711-1776), 794
 Hobart, John, Lord (1st Earl of Buckinghamshire) (1694-1756), 40, 66, 383
 Hollings, John, M.D. (1683-1739), 556, 749, 757, 778, 781
 Hosier, Admiral Francis (1673-1727), 107
 Howard, Charles (9th Earl of Suffolk) (1675-1733), 40, 93-4, 473-4
 Howard, Hon. Edward (1627-c. 1669), lvi
 Howard, Mrs., see under Suffolk
 Howe, Lady (1695-1782), 850
 Hulse, Edward, M.D. (1682-1759), 883, 894
 Hurst, Colonel, 20
 Ilay, Archibald Campbell, Earl of (3rd Duke of Argyll) (1683-1761), 44, 139-40, 143, 164, 295-7, 511, 583, 661, 706-13, 716-25, 733-4, 737, 854-6,

925; character and abilities, 296;
relations with Duke of Argyll, 297, 708
Inchiquin, William O'Brien, 4th Earl of,
M.P. (d. 1777), 265
Irby, Sir William, 2nd Bart., M.P. (1707-
1775), xxiii, 561-2, 823, 825, 831
Irish Peers, precedence of, 264-6
Irwin, Lady (1696-1764), 838

James II, 69
Jannsen, Miss, 482
Jekyll, Sir Joseph, M.P. (1663-1738),
418, 530, 569-70, 676, 684, 691;
character, 419-20
Jersey, William Villiers, 3rd Earl of (d.
1769), 779-83, 835
Johnstone, James (1643-1737), 586
Justice Clerk, The Lord (Andrew Flet-
cher), 706, 712-15, 717

Keene, Benjamin (1697-1757), 317-8
Kendal, Ermengarde Melusine von Schu-
lenburg, Duchess of (1667-1743), 11,
13-15, 84, 558-9, 845; a depository of
George II's will, 28
Kent, Henry Grey, 1st Duke of (1671-
1740), 188, 847
Kent, William (1684-1748), 487, 581
Ker, John, Earl (2nd Duke of Roxburghe)
(c. 1709-1755), 699
King, Peter, 1st Lord (1669-1734), xxiii,
24, 130-1, 242-4
Kingston, Evelyn Pierrepont, 1st Duke
of (1665-1726), 847
Kinsky, Philippus Josephus, Graf von
(1700-1749), 228-9, 347-8, 355-9,
467-8

La Chaux, page to George II, 912
Lamb, Dr., 748
Laud, Archbishop, 91
Law, John (1671-1729), 63
Leo X, on Christianity, 92
Lifford, Frederick William de la Roche-
foucauld, Earl of (1666-1749), 252-3,
261, 580, 585-6, 621
Lindsay, Patrick, M.P. (d. 1753), 572
Locke, John (1632-1709), 964
London, Bishop of, *see under* Gibson
Lonsdale, Henry Lowther, 3rd Viscount
(1694-1751), 189, 249, 450-1
Lorraine, Francis, Duke of (Emperor
Francis I) (1708-1765), xvii, xxxvii
Louisa, H.R.H. Princess (1724-1751), 895
Lovel, Thomas Coke, 1st Lord (1st Earl of
Leicester) (1697-1759), 66, 713

Lovelace, Nevill, 6th Baron (1708-1736),
231
Lowther, Sir William, 2nd Bart., M.P.
(d. 1763), 162
Lumley, John, M.P. (d. 1739), George
II on, 817
Lyttelton, George, M.P. (1st Baron)
(1709-1773), 477, 553, 613, 667, 838,
840, 850-1; favourite of Prince of
Wales; character and appearance,
386-8
Lyttelton, Sir Thomas, 938-9

Machiavelli, 87, 622
Mailbone, Mrs., Queen's German nurse,
587
Maine, Admiral, 926
Maintenon, Madame de (1635-1719), 11
Malpas, Lord, *see under* Cholmondeley
Malton, Thomas Watson Wentworth,
1st Baron (1st Marquess of Rocking-
ham) (1690-1750), 66
Manchester, William Montagu, 2nd Duke
of (1700-1739), 187
Mansel, Bussy, M.P. (4th Lord Mansel)
(d. 1750), 482
Mara, Hervey's valet, 585, 591
Marchmont, Alexander Hume Campbell,
2nd Earl of (1675-1740), 135, 200,
423
Marlborough, Charles Spencer, 3rd Duke
of (1706-1758), 661-2, 667, 699, 789,
836, 850, 889, 902; character, 246-7
Marlborough, John Churchill, 1st Duke
of (1650-1722), 9
Marlborough, Sarah, Dowager Duchess of
(1660-1744), xiv, xxvi, lv, 104, 743
Mary, H.R.H. Princess (1723-1772),
895, 930-2, 941
Mazarin, Cardinal, 144
Memoirs, Lord Hervey's, mutilation of,
xi-xiv; characteristics, lvii-lx; allu-
sions to, 1-3, 304, 346-7, 362-4, 621-3,
877
Merci, Count, 315, 325-8
Merlin's Cave, George II on, 501
Methuen, Sir Paul, M.P. (1672-1757),
25, 250; character, 101-2
Michael, Wolfgang, lx
Miremont, Armand de Bourbon, Marquis
de (1655-1732), 261
Modena, Charlotte Aglaé, Duchess of
(1700-1761), 458-9
Montagu, John, 2nd Duke of (d. 1749),
205, 635, 713, 743, 925
Montagu, Charles, M.P., 851

- Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley (1689-1762), quarrel with Pope, xlii-xlvi; Hervey's last letter to, lvi; quoted, 742
- Montandre, Francis de la Rochefoucauld, Marquis de (1672-1739), 580, 753, 789
- Montijo, Count de (1693-1763), 228-9, 318
- Montrose, James Graham, 1st Duke of (c. 1680-1742), 135, 200, 423
- Mordaunt, Hon. John, M.P. (1709-1767), 583, 589-90
- Motteville, Françoise Bertaut de (1621-1689), xvii
- Moyle, General James (d. 1738), 571-2, 713
- Namur, Thomas John Strickland, Bishop of (1679-1740), mission and character, 356-60
- National Debt, burden of, 447-9; scheme for converting, 726-32
- Neibourg, M., on Prince of Wales, 306, 861
- Nero, parallel between, and Prince of Wales, xlii, 308-11, 857-75
- Newcastle, Thomas Pelham Holles, 1st Duke of (1693-1768), 197, 249, 318, 377-8, 391, 394, 451, 493-4, 511, 586, 621, 635, 820-1, 886; derogatory allusions to, xxxvii, 131, 209, 580-2, 592, 595-6, 842-3, 953; opposes Hervey's appointment to be Lord Privy Seal, l-liv; appointed Secretary of State instead of Pulteney, 6-7; relations with George II as Prince of Wales, 29, 846-8, 855; well disposed to Walpole, 173-4; opposes Hervey's elevation to the Lords, 204; echoes George II on foreign affairs, 217, 344-5, 517-8; uneasiness at exclusion from negotiations with Wasner, 355; flirtation with Princess Emily, 654-5; his interest superior to Hervey's, 669; in favour of concessions to Frederick, 673, 700; speech on the Prince's allowance, 696-7; political aims, 700-1, 716, 829; conduct in Porteous Riots debates, 706-9, 711, 715-25; low ebb of his interest at Court, 731-2, 831, 854-5; suggests taking Carteret into the government, 733; attacked by Duke of Argyll in House of Lords, 737-8; opposed to a rupture in royal family, 786, 809-10, 827; Walpole's dissatisfaction with him, 829-30; sends for Walpole during Queen's illness, 882-3; believes that Queen's power will pass to Princess Emily, 918; at Cabinet meetings in 1740, 925, 927-8, 930, 933-6, 938, 940-1; position in new government, (1742), lv, 945, 949-50
- Norfolk, Edward Howard, 9th Duke of (1686-1777), 837-8
- Norfolk, Duchess of, 838, 878
- Norris, Admiral Sir John, M.P. (c. 1660-1749), 925, 933, 938
- North, Francis, 7th Lord (1st Earl of Guildford) (1704-1790), 749, 766, 804-6, 884-7; George II on, 817
- Ogle, Admiral Sir Chaloner (1681-1750), 926, 934-5, 937, 940
- Oglethorpe, James Edward, M.P. (1696-1785), 796
- Onslow, Arthur (1691-1766), 74-5, 130-1, 288, 530
- Onslow, Thomas, 2nd Baron (c. 1682-1741), 188
- Orange, Prince of (1711-1751), 286, 366-72, 390-2, 422, 506, 902; marriage to Princess Royal announced, 192; solemnised, 263-71; his appearance, 194, 231, 271-2; arrival and illness, 229-32; popularity and departure, 280-4; parting conversation with Hervey, 289-90
- Orkney, George Hamilton, Earl of (1666-1737), 707
- Orleans, Philip, Duke of (1674-1723), 51, 63, 459
- Ormond, James Butler, Duke of (1665-1745), 171, 937
- Oxenden, Sir George, M.P. (1694-1775), character, 740-2
- Oxford, Robert Harley, 1st Earl of (1661-1724), 9
- Paine, Mrs., dresser to Princess of Wales, 758, 778
- Parliament: *House of Commons*: 1727, Civil list, 34-5; 1728, election petitions, 75-6; vote of credit, 78-9; 1729, deficiency in civil list, 100-1; 1730, treaty of Seville, 112-4; Hessians, 114-5; Dunkirk, 115-8; 1733, mutiny bill and supply, 135; excise bill, 147-68; committee of enquiry into frauds on customs, 178, 184; 1734, address, 241; triennial bill, etc., 255-6; vote of credit, 258-60; 1735, navy and army, 412-7; election petitions, 417-20; 1736, repeal of Corporation and Test Acts, 530-1; Mortmain and Quakers bills, 530, 535; address on Prince of

- Wales's marriage, 553; 1737, Prince of Wales's allowance, 684-92; Mutiny Bill, 699; conversion of national debt, 726-32; Porteous Riots, 734-5; censorship of plays, 738; Princess of Wales's jointure, 738; *House of Lords*: 1733, South Sea enquiry, 197-9; 1734, address, 237-41; army commission bill, 245-8; vote of credit, 258-60; 1735, petition of Scotch peers, 408-9, 423-34; mutiny bill, 435-45; 1736, Mortmain and Quakers bills, 535-8; 1737, Porteous Riots, 659-61, 705-25, 736-8; Prince of Wales's allowance, 696-9; Mutiny Bill, 699; censorship of plays, 738; Princess of Wales's jointure, 738
- Patino, Don José de (1666-1736), 317-8
- Pecrage bill, 142
- Pelham, Henry, M.P. (1694-1754), liii, 18, 150, 161-2, 165, 178, 249, 418-9, 451, 673, 731, 733, 837, 945, 949-50; beloved by Walpole, 120
- Pelham, James, M.P. (d. 1761), 838
- Pembroke, Countess of, 850
- Pembroke, Mary, Countess Dowager of (d. 1749), 583, 587-90, 884-7
- Pembroke, Thomas Herbert, 8th Earl of (1656-1733), 589-90
- Pembroke, Henry Herbert, 9th Earl of (1693-1756), 251, 406-8, 657, 673, 743, 810, 814, 816, 823, 825, 827-8, 881, 886-7, 925, 936
- Perry, Micajah, M.P. (d. 1753), 168
- Peter the Great (1672-1725), xxxii
- Petronius, 309
- Pitt, William, M.P. (1708-1778), deprived of commission, 553; Prince of Wales's favourite, 613; incites Prince of Wales, 667
- Poland, affairs of, *see under* Foreign Affairs
- Pomfret, Thomas Fermor, 1st Earl of (1698-1753), 187, 581
- Pomfret, Countess of (1698-1753), 605
- Pope, Alexander (1688-1744), xi, xvi, xxiv, lvi-vii, 382; quarrel with Hervey, xlii-xlvii
- Porpora, Nuccolo Antonio (1686-1767), Neapolitan composer, 309
- Porteous Riots, 570-3; *see also under* Parliament
- Portland, Countess of (1672-1751), 406
- Potter, John, Bishop of Oxford, then Archbishop of Canterbury (1674-1747), 398, 547-8, 583, 653, 759, 802, 907-8, 925, 930-2
- Powlet, Lord Harry, M.P. (1691-1759), 938-9
- Poyntz, Stephen, (1685-1750), 78, 345, 355, 507, 799
- Prendergast, Sir Thomas, 2nd Bart., M.P. (d. 1760), 162
- Presbyterians, *see under* Ecclesiastical affairs
- Pretender, the, 4, 5, 10, 11, 58, 106, 170, 171, 317-18, 566, 797, 856, 937, 941
- Prie, Madame de (1698-1727), 63
- Prince of Wales, Frederick, H.R.H. (1707-1751), relations with Hervey, *see under* Hervey; relations with his parents and sisters, xxx-xxvii, 95-6, 98, 101-2, 205-7, 220, 232-5, 255-6, 272-7, 298-304, 337, 408, 483, 503-5, 554-6, 560-3, 611-13, 618-21, 624-31, 640-41, 643-6, 658, 664-5, 670-1, 676-7, 681, 693, 749, 774-5, 797, 803-6, 812-3, 816-7, 820-2, 828, 839, 843-4, 857-8, 863-4, 873, 875, 885-9, 901-2; character, 97-8, 305-12, 857-77; Pulteney on, 106; marriage, 119, 298-301, 408, 474, 505-6, 548-55; neutral on excise bill, 176; unpopular, 282; attitude to Prince of Orange's naturalisation, 286; Prince of Orange on, 290; views on Lady Suffolk's retirement, 381; and Princess Royal's reputed pregnancy, 305, 392, 422; relations with Lady Archibald Hamilton, 475-6; severs relations with Miss Vane, 476-83; conduct towards Queen during her Regency, 555-6, 560-4, 611-14; alleged relations with Madame d'Elitz, 559; question of his impotence, 614-18; conduct during King's danger at sea, 624-35; his views on women, 628, 792-3; helps to extinguish a fire, 643-4; conversations with Walpole, 647-8; kissed by the King, 649; his allowance, 95-96, 196-7, 234-5, 255, 554-5, 661-705; and Princess of Wales's accouchement, 749, 756-93; rumoured political projects, xxxii-v, 794-802, 855-7; christening and title of his daughter, 802-6; expulsion from St. James's, 806-39; his three grievances against the King, 839-40; correspondence with his parents published, 841-5; divisions at his court, 847-52; and Queen's illness and death, 883-9, 892-3, 900-2; position in 1742, lv, 943-5, 948, 954

- Princess of Wales, H.R.H. Augusta (1719-1772), 613, 627, 658, 748, 802-5, 838, 841; selection by George II, 474, 505-6, 814; marriage, character and behaviour, 548-56, 560-5, 807, 851, 872-3; alleged pregnancy, 563, 614, 749-50; consummation of her marriage questioned, 614-8; her jointure, 672, 674, 686, 694, 698-9, 738; accouchement, 756-69, 775-83; her political ignorance 791-2; Queen visits her, 793; allowed to keep her child, 806-8, 814-5; correspondence with King and Queen, 821-5, 831-6
- Princess Royal, Anne, H.R.H. The (1709-1759), xxxviii, 760; engagement and character, 192-6, 229-32; marriage, 263-72, 280, 286; supports Handel, 273-4, 371; and Prince of Wales, 272-6, 305, 775; on George II, 276-8; departure, 283, 289-91; return and supposed pregnancy, 305, 365-72, 389-92, 422-3; disagreeable situation in Holland, 506; nearly dies in childbed, 624, 639-40, 670; allowance from King, 690; affection for Lady Deloraine, 746
- Prussia, Frederick William I, King of (1688-1740), xxxii, 64, 102-3, 814, 840, 917-8
- Prussia, Sophie Dorothea, Queen of (1687-1757), and George I's will, 840; George II on, 917
- Prussia, Princesses of, question of marriage to Prince of Wales, 119, 814
- Pulteney, William, M.P. (Earl of Bath) (1684-1764), xv, xxiv, li, lv; verses on Hervey's marriage, xvi; quarrel with Hervey, xxv-xxx; character and career, 6-9, 790-1; rivalry with Wyndham, 21-2, 256; bids for civil list, 31-2; out of favour at court, 37, 39; friendship for Lord Essex, 96; urges Hervey to join the opposition, 103-10; denounces mobbing of Walpole, 168; his post in the shadow cabinet, 170; as a writer, 263; and Miss Vane, 481-2; comment on preliminaries of Vienna, 517; relations with French ambassador, 520; temporary political inactivity, 529, 667, 735; epigrams on George II, 651; on Lord Chesterfield, 652; and Prince's allowance, 667, 684-90, 696; attitude to scheme for conversion of national debt, 730-1; opposes bill for censorship of plays, 738; relations with Carteret, 752-3; disapproves of Prince's conduct, 779, 789-91; consulted by Prince, 821-2; his power in 1742, 945, 949-52, 955; elevation to the Lords, 953-4
- Pulteney, Mrs. (1697-1758), 7-8, 471, 731
- Purcel, Mrs., 492, 582, 585-7, 915
- Quakers, *see under* Ecclesiastical affairs
- Queensberry, Charles, 3rd Duke of (1698-1778), 100, 136, 423
- Queensberry, Catherine, Duchess of (d. 1777), and Gay, 98-100
- Racine, 145
- Ranby, John (1703-1773), 880, 890-4, 906, 908
- Retz, Cardinal de (1613-1679), *Memoirs of*, xvii, 2, 144-5
- Richmond, Charles, 2nd Duke of (1701-1750), 250-2, 405-7, 477, 635, 673, 713, 810, 814, 827-8, 925, 928, 938
- Richmond, Duchess of, 477
- Ripperda, Jan Willem, Duke de (1690-1737), 53, 55, 58-9
- Rixleven, Madame, 561
- Robinson, Thomas (1st Baron Grantham) (1695-1770), 393-4, 937
- Rochester, Henry Hyde, 4th Earl of Clarendon and 2nd Earl of (1672-1753), 951
- Roucy, Charlotte de (1653-1743), 252-3, 261, 583, 627
- Roxburgh, John, 1st Duke of (d. 1741), 847
- Rundle, Thomas, Bishop of Derry (1688-1743), 533, 535; and Bishopric of Gloucester, 399-405
- Rushout, Sir John, Bart., M.P. (1684-1775), 170
- Rutland, Dowager Duchess of, 595
- Ryder, Sir Dudley, *see* Solicitor-General
- St. Albans, Charles Beauclerk, 2nd Duke of (1696-1751), 187
- St. Albans, Duchess of (d. 1742), 846
- Sands, Dr., 624
- Sandys, Samuel, M.P. (1st Lord Sandys) (1695-1770), 170
- Sardinia, King of, 50, 219-20
- Saxe-Gotha, Duchess Dowager of, 802, 805
- Scarborough, Richard Lumley, 2nd Earl of (1688-1740), xxiv, 278; career and character, 70-1, 250 n; contrasted with

- Chesterfield, 73-4; and excise bill, 154-5, 160; resignation, 184-5, 247-50; refuses Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, 454-5; remonstrates with Prince of Wales, 665-7; speech on the Prince's application, 697; illness, 750; on George II, 750-1
- Schaub, Sir Luke, (d. 1758), 753, 780, 789, 826
- Schulenburg, M., 558-60
- Schutz, Mr., 370
- Schutz, Miss, 506
- Schutz, Mrs., 580, 583, 627
- Secker, Thomas, Bishop of Bristol (Bishop of Oxford) (1693-1768), 405
- Selkirk, Charles Hamilton, 2nd Earl of (1683-1739), 583, 593-4
- Selwyn, Mrs. (1691-1777), 605, 607, 882
- Shaw, —, 582
- Shelburne, William Fitzmaurice-Petty, 2nd Earl of (Marquess of Lansdowne) (1737-1805), lix
- Sherlock, Thomas, Bishop of Bangor, then of Salisbury (1678-1761), 583, 676; career and character, 88-9; writer for court, 263; intrigues at court, 294-5, 410-11, 682-3, 703; translated to Salisbury, 399; opposes Mortmain and Quakers bills, 531; rebuked by Queen, 534-5; complains to Queen of Hervey, 540-2; no longer designed for London, 543-8; passed over for Canterbury, 652; courted by Newcastle, 701, 733; and Porteous Riots affair, 706-9, 719-26; gives Queen his view on Prince's conduct, 852
- Sherwin, Rev. Dr. (d. 1735), xlv
- Shippen, William, M.P. (1673-1743), 34
- Shipton, John (d. 1748), 892-3
- Shirley, Lady Frances (d. 1778), 850
- Sicily, history of, 319-25
- Sinzendorff, Philipp Ludwig, Graf von (1671-1742), 57
- Skerrit, Mary (Lady Walpole) (d. 1738), 86 and n., 294, 420-1, 534, 633, 748, 832
- Sloane, Sir Hans, Bart. (1660-1753), 580, 883
- Solicitor-General, The (Sir Dudley Ryder, M.P.) (1691-1756), 418
- Somerset, Charles Seymour, 6th Duke of (1662-1748), 20
- Sophie Dorothea, wife of George I (1666-1726), never referred to by George II, 917
- South Sea affair, 184-7, 189-90, 197-9, 364
- Sporus, Hervey compared to, xlii, xlv and n., xlv
- Stafford, Claude Charlotte, Countess of (d. 1739), 551
- Stair, John Dalrymple, 2nd Earl of (1673-1747), 100, 200, 423; denounces Walpole to the Queen, 135-45; deprived of his regiment, 288-9
- Stanhope, James, 1st Earl (1673-1721), 953; letter to George I, about George II, xxxii, 849
- Stanhope, William, *see* Harrington
- Starhemberg, Count Conrad von (1689-1727), 54
- Stone, Andrew (1703-1773), 581
- Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, 3rd Earl of (1672-1739), 435-6
- Strickland, Sir William, Bart., M.P. (1686-1735), 450
- Stuarts, The, 187, 252
- Suetonius, 164, 306, 308, 311, 315, 861, 863-8, 870-4
- Suffolk, Henrietta (Hobart), Countess of (1681-1767), lviii, 98, 139, 143, 169, 177, 296, 495, 498, 600-4, 744, 752, 855, 919; position at court, 39-45, 67-8, 93-4, 472-4; retirement, 379-85, 392; marriage, 471-2
- Suffolk, Earl of, *see* Howard
- Sunderland, Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of (1674-1722), 11, 33, 849, 918, 951, 953; contrast between his and Walpole's policy in church matters, 90
- Sunderland, Robert Spencer, 2nd Earl of (1640-1702), 293
- Sundon, William Clayton, 1st Baron, M.P. (1692-1752), 789
- Sundon, Lady (Mrs. Clayton), (d. 1742), 66-8, 392, 396, 410, 486, 577, 587-90, 605-8, 744, 753-4, 785, 789, 882
- Tacitus, 308-9, 311, 330, 364-5, 622, 862-8, 870-1, 874
- Talbot, Charles, 1st Baron (1685-1737), 242-3, 399-405, 424, 430, 470, 500, 530, 536, 548, 568, 591, 659
- Tankerville, Countess of, 490-1
- Teed, 582
- Tesier, George Lewis, F.R.S. (d. 1742), 877, 879, 914
- Thackeray, on the Memoirs, lx
- Titchburne, Mrs., 576, 759-60
- Torrington, George Byng, 1st Viscount (1663-1733), 37-8, 52, 57, 339
- Torrington, Pattee Byng, 2nd Viscount (1699-1747), 288, 951

- Torrington, Lady, 805, 838, 850
- Townshend, Charles, 2nd Viscount (1674-1738), 9, 29, 59, 78, 102-3, 105, 151, 153, 280, 495, 953; character and causes of quarrel with Walpole, 79-87; retires, 118-9
- Townshend, William, M.P. (1702-1738), 176, 554, 758, 817
- Townshend, Mrs., 554, 658, 748
- Trevor, Thomas, 1st Baron (1658-1730), 24, 85-7, 120, 473-4
- Trevor, Lady (d. 1746), 86-7
- Trevor, Robert Hampden (1st Viscount Hampden), (1706-1783), 941
- Tyrconnel, John Brownlow, 1st Viscount, M.P. (d. 1754), 162
- Vane, Hon. Anne (1710-1736), relations with Prince of Wales and Hervey, xxxix-xli, 775; dubious paternity of her child, 290, 614-6; resumed relations with Hervey, 388-9; severance of relations with Prince of Wales and death, 475-83
- Vane, Fitzfrederick (1732-1736), xxxix, 290, 476, 483, 614
- Vane, Hon. Henry, M.P., 1st Earl of Darlington (1705-1758), 170, 481-2, 951, 955
- Vaucher, Paul, lx
- Venn, Rev. Richard (1619-1740), denounces Rundle, 399-400
- Vernon, Admiral Edward (1684-1757), 926-7, 933, 940-1
- Vickers, 587
- Villars, Marshal (Duc de) (1653-1734), 328
- Villette, Madame de (Marie-Claire Deschamps de Marsilly, Lady Bolingbroke) (1675-1750), negotiates for Bolingbroke's pardon, 10-13
- Voltaire (1696-1778), quoted, 37-8
- Vreid, valet de chambre to Prince of Wales, 481, 615
- Wade, General George, M.P. (1673-1748), 571-2
- Wager, Admiral Sir Charles, M.P. (1666-1743), brings George II over from Hanover in storm, 634, 636-8; 925, 927, 933
- Wake, William, Archbishop of Canterbury (1657-1737), and George I's will, xxxv, 27; death, 652
- Waldegrave, James, 1st Earl (1685-1741), ambassador at Paris, 521, 933-7
- Walmoden, Amelia Sophia von (Countess of Yarmouth) (1704-1765), beginning of George II's attachment, 457-9; his fondness for her, 507-8, 656; birth of their child, 538-9; its death, 743; his impatience to return to her, 549; incident at Hanover, 557-60; the Queen invites him to bring her to England, 597, 599-610, 754; apparently forgotten, 743, 746; lottery tickets for her, 852-3; Walpole advises George II to send for her, 918-20
- Walpole, Edward, M.P. (1706-1784), 165
- Walpole, Horace, M.P. (1st Baron Walpole of Wolterton) (1678-1757), xlv; ambassador at Paris, 29, 31, 116-7, 521; plenipotentiary at Congress of Soissons, 78; missions to Holland, 230, 283-4, 286, 346, 352, 354, 365-6; character, 284-5; ambassador at the Hague, 367-70, 422, 518, 902; accompanies King to Hanover, 556, 559-60, 592, 637; relations with Queen, 606, 732; in favour of national debt conversion scheme, 731-3; effect of his condolences on George II, 917
- Walpole, Horace (4th Earl of Orford) (1717-1797), xi, xiv and n, xlv, lv-vi, lviii, lx
- Walpole, Margaret (Rolle), Lady (1709-1781), 742
- Walpole, Sir Robert (1st Earl of Orford) (1676-1745), xxi, xxiv, xxvi-xxvii, xxix-xxxi, xl, xlviii-lviii, lv, lvii-lx, 95-6, 256, 298, 367, 639, 646, 743, 796, 850-1, 944, 953; relations with Pulteney, 6-9; 21, 103; and with Bolingbroke, 11, 13-16; character, 17-19; position at accession of George II, 22-35; drafts King's speeches, 25-6, 35, 202-4, 235; relations with Dodington, 29, 176, 387-8, 454, 653; and with Sir William Yonge, 35-7; and with Wilmington, 39, 101, 174, 653-4; his continuance in office and its causes, 39, 46-9, 68; chooses new Parliament, 65-6; dislike of Mrs. Clayton (Lady Sundon), 66-7, 605-8, 753-4, 789; relations with Chesterfield, 71-3, 119, 135, 171-3, 278, 280; and with Onslow, 74; and with Miss Skeritt, 86, 294, 420-1, 534, 633, 748, 832; quarrel with Townshend, 79-87, 102, 105, 118-9; his foreign policy, 82-3, 110, 217-8, 221, 227, 235, 318, 340-8, 354-65, 376-8, 393-4, 445-6, 464, 467-70, 510-2, 517-20, 523; his

ecclesiastical policy, 88-91, 123, 130-2, 401-5, 530-5, 541-8, 652-3; and censorship of plays, 98, 738; relations with Lord Stair, 100, 136-40, 288-9; makes love to Lady Hervey, 103-4, 107; Pulteney on, 108; affection for Henry Pelham, 120; relations with Hoadly, 123, 127-30, 191-2, 395-9, 794-5; excise bill, 132-171; his enemies, 171-7; speech to the Whigs, 179-84; opposed to parliamentary enquiries, 186-7, 364-5; defeats in Parliament, 197-9, 417-9; on George II, 207-8, 250-1, 507, 603, 642, 650, 751, 918-9; fills posts of Lord Chancellor and Lord Chief Justice, 242; corrects a pamphlet by Hervey, 245; on Lord Scarborough's resignation, 249-50; and the army, 257-8, 445-6, 507-8, 526-7, 707-8; unpopularity, 281-2; relations with Horace Walpole, 285, 367-9, 606; intrigues against him at court, 294-5, 752-4; his jealous disposition, 295, 355, 809-10, 924; relations with Lord Illy and Duke of Argyll, 296-7, 707-9; difficulty in inducing George II to do business, 341, 556-7; visits to Norfolk, 373, 379, 493, 524, 621, 749, 854; lectures Queen on importance of taking care of herself, 373-6, 378-9; relations with Lady Suffolk, 382, 392-3; Bishopric of Gloucester, 401-5; Mastership of Horse, 405-7; attitude to Carteret, 410, 702-3, 733, 826-7, 837; disposition of patronage, 451-5, 668-9, 740-1; opposes George II's visits to Hanover, 456, 506-7; George II asks the Queen to consult him, 458, 560; advises the Queen to encourage the King's love affairs, 490-2, 597-608, 656-8; his high favour with the King, 493-4, 497, 649-50; relations with Lord Harrington, 495-6, 556; sceptical as to Prince of Wales's marriage, 505-6; on the Princess of Wales, 550, 555; Gin Act, 569-70; Porteous Riots, 572, 660-1, 707-9, 715-16; in Hervey's poem and play, 580, 582, 591-3; on George II's love letters, 603, 642; anxiety during King's danger at sea, 625-7, 634-5; interview with Prince of Wales, 647-8; Latin conversation with Hervey about George II, 650; Pulteney's epigram on, 651; tells Duke of Dorset his opinion of him, 652-4; unseemly style of talking to the Prin-

cesses, 654-6, 919; and Prince's application to Parliament, 662, 664, 666-78, 682-97, 700-5, 769-71; relations with Duke of Newcastle, 700-1, 715-6, 718, 733-4, 829-31; opposes scheme for converting national debt, 726-33; indifference to legitimacy of descendants, 742; and Lady Deloraine, 744-5, 747-8; and accouchement of Princess of Wales, 756-7, 764-73, 777-8, 782-9; on his own importance, 773-4; on project of separating England and Hanover, 797-802; and the expulsion of Prince from St. James's, 693, 767-73, 786-8, 806-11, 820-8, 832, 834-6, 839; on the Queen, 808-9, 827; and publication of correspondence between the two courts, 841-9; ordered to buy lottery tickets for Madame Walmoden, 852-3; death of his wife, 854; during Queen's last illness, 882-3, 898-9, 901, 903-8; advises George II to send for Madame Walmoden, 918-9; Hervey's letter to, 921-4; at Cabinet meetings (1740), 925, 928, 930-1, 933, 935-40
Walpole, Robert, 1st Baron (2nd Earl of Orford) (1701-1751), 742
Walsingham, Pétronille Mélusine von Schulenburg, Countess of (Lady Chesterfield) (1693-1778), 11, 13, 558-9
Ward, Joshua (1685-1761), his pill, 880
Wasner, sent by Emperor to England, 355-6
Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of (1769-1852), and General Hervey's copy of the Memoirs, xii
Wellington, 4th Duke of, returns copy of Memoirs to Windsor Archives, xii
Wemyss, Lady, 573
Westmorland, John Fane, 7th Earl of (1685-1762), 743
Weston, Edward (1702-1770), 507
Weymouth, Thomas Thynne, 2nd Viscount (1710-1751), 669
Wilcocks, Joseph, Bishop of Rochester (1673-1756), 500
Williams, Charles Hanbury, M.P. (aft. Sir C. Hanbury Williams) (1709-1759), 829-30; his character of Lady Hervey, xvii-xviii; and of Hervey, xvi, xl-li, xlviii
William III, 69
Willoughby, Hugh, 15th Baron, of Parham (d. 1765), 944
Wilmington, Spencer Compton, 1st Earl of (1673-1743), li, 495, 500, 548, 673,

- 925; character and position at accession of George II, 22-6, 28, 30, 35, 46-7, 101; created Baron Wilmington, 39, 74; Earl of Wilmington and Lord President, 120; the Garter, 205; at meeting with Committee of London Dissenters, 131; George II's opinion of him, 153; relations with Walpole, 174-5, 294, 653-4; description of, in Hervey's poem, 578-9, 582; and Hervey's play, 592-4; present at Princess of Wales's accouchement, 759, 768
- Wilson, Alexander, Provost of Edinburgh, 734
- Winchilsea, Daniel Finch, 7th Earl of and 3rd Earl of Nottingham (1688-1769), 120, 170, 367, 409, 538, 699, 789, 949
- Windham, William, 744, 747-8
- Winnington, Thomas, M.P. (1696-1746), 451-5, 851
- Württemberg, Duke of, 814
- Wyndham, Sir William, 3rd Bart., M.P. (1680-1740), rivalry with Pulteney, 8, 256; character and career, 19-22; speech in Dunkirk debate, 115-6; de-claims against excise bill, 163; deplores mobbing of Walpole, 168; post in shadow cabinet, 170; never writes, 263; on preliminaries of Vienna, 517; relations with French ambassador, 520; a declining force in Parliament, 529-30; relations with Carteret, 752-3; sent for by Prince of Wales, 822
- Yager, the King's house apothecary, 836
- Yonge, Sir William, M.P. (1693-1755), author of *Sedition and Defamation* Dis- played, xxvii; dismissal and character, 35-7; appointed Secretary at War, 451
- York, Ernest Augustus, Duke of (Bishop of Osnabrück) (1674-1728), his will, 839-40
- York Buildings Company, 187
- Zell, George William, Duke of (d. 1705), 917

